arXiv:1405.5739v2 [math.DS] 25 Aug 2015

Resonance identities and stability of symmetric closed characteristics on symmetric compact star-shaped hypersurfaces

Hui Liu[1],* Yiming Long[2],†

[1] Key Laboratory of Wu Wen-Tsun Mathematics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, People's Republic of China

[2] Chern Institute of Mathematics and LPMC, Nankai University, Tianjin 300071, People's Republic of China

Abstract

So far, it is still unknown whether all the closed characteristics on a symmetric compact star-shaped hypersurface Σ in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$ are symmetric. In order to understand behaviors of such orbits, in this paper we establish first two new resonance identities for symmetric closed characteristics on symmetric compact star-shaped hypersurface Σ in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$ when there exist only finitely many geometrically distinct symmetric closed characteristics on Σ, which extend the identity established by Liu and Long in [LLo1] of 2013 for symmetric strictly convex hypersurfaces. Then as an application of these identities and the identities established by Liu, Long and Wang recently in [LLW1] for all closed characteristics on the same hypersurface, we prove that if there exist exactly two geometrically distinct closed characteristics on a symmetric compact star-shaped hypersuface in $\mathbf{R}^4$, then both of them must be elliptic.

Key words: compact star-shaped hypersurface, closed characteristic, Hamiltonian systems, resonance identity, symmetric, stability.

AMS Subject Classification: 58E05, 37J45, 34C25.

*Partially supported by NSFC (No. 11401555), China Postdoctoral Science Foundation No. 2014T70589, CUSF(No. WK3470000001). E-mail:huiliu@ustc.edu.cn

†Partially supported by NSFC (No. 11131004), MCME and LPMC of MOE of China, Nankai University and BCMIIS of Capital Normal University. E-mail: longym@nankai.edu.cn.

1 Introduction and main results

Let Σ be a C^3 compact hypersurface in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$ strictly star-shaped with respect to the origin, i.e., the tangent hyperplane at any $x \in \Sigma$ does not intersect the origin. We denote the set of all such hypersurfaces by $\mathcal{H}_{st}(2n)$, and denote by $\mathcal{H}_{con}(2n)$ the subset of $\mathcal{H}_{st}(2n)$ which consists of all strictly convex hypersurfaces. We also denote the set of all hypersurfaces $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{st}(2n)$ (or $\mathcal{H}_{con}(2n)$), which are symmetric with respect to the origin, i.e., $\Sigma = -\Sigma$, by $\mathcal{SH}_{st}(2n)$ (or $\mathcal{SH}_{con}(2n)$). We consider closed characteristics (τ, y) on Σ, which are solutions of the following problem

$$\begin{cases} \dot{y} = JN_\Sigma(y), \\ y(\tau) = y(0), \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where $J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -I_n \\ I_n & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, I_n is the identity matrix in $\mathbf{R}^n$, $\tau > 0$, $N_\Sigma(y)$ is the outward normal vector of Σ at y normalized by the condition $N_\Sigma(y) \cdot y = 1$. Here $a \cdot b$ denotes the standard inner product of $a, b \in \mathbf{R}^{2n}$. A closed characteristic (τ, y) is *prime*, if τ is the minimal period of y. Two closed characteristics (τ, y) and (σ, z) are *geometrically distinct*, if $y(\mathbf{R}) \neq z(\mathbf{R})$. We denote by $\mathcal{T}(\Sigma)$ the set of all geometrically distinct closed characteristics on Σ. A closed characteristic (τ, y) on $\Sigma \in \mathcal{SH}_{st}(2n)$ is *symmetric* if $y(\mathbf{R}) = -y(\mathbf{R})$, *non-symmetric* if $y(\mathbf{R}) \cap (-y(\mathbf{R})) = \emptyset$. We denote by $\mathcal{T}(\Sigma)$ ($\mathcal{T}_s(\Sigma)$) the set of geometrically distinct (symmetric) closed characteristics (τ, y) on $\Sigma \in \mathcal{SH}_{st}(2n)$. A closed characteristic (τ, y) is *non-degenerate* if 1 is a Floquet multiplier of y of precisely algebraic multiplicity 2, and is *hyperbolic* if 1 is a double Floquet multiplier of it and all the other Floquet multipliers are not on $\mathbf{U} = \{z \in \mathbf{C} \mid |z| = 1\}$, i.e., the unit circle in the complex plane, and is *elliptic* if all the Floquet multipliers of y are on $\mathbf{U}$.

The pioneer global result ${}^{\#}\mathcal{T}(\Sigma) \geq 1$ was proved by Rabinowitz in [Rab1] for $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{st}(2n)$ and by A. Weinstein in [Wei1] for $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{con}(2n)$ in 1978. For further results on the multiplicity of closed characteristics on $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{con}(2n)$ or $\mathcal{H}_{st}(2n)$, we refer to [EkL1], [EkH1], [Szu1], [HWZ1], [LoZ1], [WHL1], [Wan2] and [HuL1] as well as [Lon3]. Recently ${}^{\#}\mathcal{T}(\Sigma) \geq 2$ was first proved for every $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{st}(4)$ by Cristofaro-Gardiner and Hutchings in [CGH1] without any pinching or non-degeneracy conditions. Different proofs of this result can be found in [GHHM], [LLo2] and [GiG1].

Note that for any $\Sigma \in \mathcal{SH}_{con}(2n)$, it was proved by Liu, Long and Zhu in [LLZ1] of 2002 that for any $(\tau, y) \in \mathcal{T}(\Sigma)$, either (τ, y) is symmetric and then it satisfies $y(t + \tau/2) = -y(t)$ for all $t \in \mathbf{R}$, or (τ, y) is non-symmetric and then $(\tau, y) \neq (\tau, -y) \in \mathcal{T}(\Sigma)$ holds too. Thus closed characteristics on Σ are classified into two classes, symmetric or non-symmetric as defined above. It is natural to conjecture that $\mathcal{T}(\Sigma) = \mathcal{T}_s(\Sigma)$ for every $\Sigma \in \mathcal{SH}_{st}(2n)$. We are aware of only two results in this

spirit. The first one is ${}^{\#}\mathcal{T}_s(\Sigma) \geq 2$ for every $\Sigma \in \mathcal{SH}_{con}(2n)$ proved by Wang (Theorem 1.1 of [Wan3], 2012). Together with [LLZ1], it implies

$$\mathcal{T}(\Sigma) = \mathcal{T}_s(\Sigma) \tag{1.2}$$

for all $\Sigma \in \mathcal{SH}_{con}(2n)$ with $n = 2$ or 3 provided ${}^{\#}\mathcal{T}(\Sigma) = n$. The second result is that (1.2) holds for all $\Sigma \in \mathcal{SH}_{con}(8)$ provided ${}^{\#}\mathcal{T}(\Sigma) = 4$ proved by Liu, Long, Wang and Zhang recently in [LLWZ]. But in general, whether (1.2) holds for every $\Sigma \in \mathcal{SH}_{st}(2n)$ is still open.

Note that recently some resonance identities for closed characteristics on compact star-shaped hypersurface in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$ were established in [LLW1], they are useful tools for studying the multiplicity and stability of closed characteristics. Note that also recently in [LLo1], the authors established a new resonance identity for symmetric closed characteristics on symmetric convex Hamiltonian hypersurfaces and obtained some new results about the multiplicity and stability of symmetric orbits as applications. Motivated by the methods of [LLo1], [Vit2] and [LLW1], the first goal of this paper is to establish two new resonance identities for symmetric closed characteristics on symmetric compact star-shaped hypersurfaces in Theorem 1.1 below. We believe that such identities will play important roles in understanding behaviors of closed characteristics on such symmetric hypersurfaces, including the study on (1.2) in general.

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose $\Sigma \in \mathcal{SH}_{st}(2n)$ satisfies ${}^{\#}\mathcal{T}_s(\Sigma) < +\infty$. Denote all the geometrically distinct prime symmetric closed characteristics on Σ by $\{(\tau_j, y_j)\}_{1\leq j\leq k}$. Then the following identities hold*

$$\sum_{\substack{1\leq j\leq k \\ \hat{\bar{i}}(y_j)>0}} \frac{\hat{\bar{\chi}}(y_j)}{\hat{\bar{i}}(y_j)} = 1, \tag{1.3}$$

$$\sum_{\substack{1\leq j\leq k \\ \hat{\bar{i}}(y_j)<0}} \frac{\hat{\bar{\chi}}(y_j)}{\hat{\bar{i}}(y_j)} = 0, \tag{1.4}$$

where $\hat{\bar{i}}(y_j) \in \mathbf{R}$ is the mean index of y_j given by Definition 3.6 below, $\hat{\bar{\chi}}(y_j) \in \mathbf{Q}$ is the average Euler characteristic given by Definition 3.7 and Remark 3.8 below. Specially by (3.19) below we have

$$\hat{\bar{\chi}}(y) = \frac{2}{\bar{K}(y)} \sum_{\substack{1\leq k\leq \bar{K}(y)/2 \\ 0\leq l\leq 2n-2}} (-1)^{\bar{i}(y^{2k-1})+l} \bar{k}_l(y^{2k-1}), \tag{1.5}$$

$\bar{K}(y) \in 2\mathbf{N}$ is the minimal period of critical modules of iterations of y defined in Proposition 3.5, $\bar{i}(y^m)$ is the index defined in Definition 3.6 (cf. Definition 2.7 and Theorem 2.8 below), $\bar{k}_l(y^m)$ is the critical type numbers of y^m given by Definition 3.2 and Remark 3.3 below.

Note that the idea of the proof of Theorem 1.1 is a natural extension of that of Theorem 1.1 in [LLW1]. Thus in some parts of the proof of Theorem 1.1 below, we only point out its difference from and make necessary modifications on that in [LLW1].

Remark 1.2. When $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{con}(2n)$ and is symmetric, we can choose $K = 0$ and φ to satisfy Proposition 2.2 (iv) of [WHL1] and (2.19) below. Then $e(K) = 0$ in Theorem 2.16. Noticing that $C_{S^1,l}(\bar{F}_K, S^1 \cdot \bar{x})$ is exactly isomorphic to $C_{S^1,l}(\Psi_a, S^1 \cdot \dot{\bar{x}})$ which is defined in Definition 2.5 of [LLo1], then our identity (1.3) coincides with the identity (1.2) of Theorem 1.1 of [LLo1]. Thus our Theorem 1.1 generalizes the resonance identity in [LLo1] for symmetric convex hypersurfaces to symmetric star-shaped hypersurfaces.

As applications of Theorem 1.1 to closed characteristics on $\Sigma \in \mathcal{SH}_{st}(2n)$, we study the stability of such orbits. For this stability problem, we refer the readers to [Eke1], [DDE1], [Lon1], [Lon2], [LoZ1], [WHL1], [Wan1] and the references therein. In particular, in [Lon2] of 2000, Long proved that $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{con}(4)$ and ${}^{\#}\mathcal{T}(\Sigma) = 2$ imply that both of the closed characteristics must be elliptic, in [WHL1] of 2007, W. Wang, X. Hu and Y. Long proved further that $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{con}(4)$ and ${}^{\#}\mathcal{T}(\Sigma) = 2$ imply that both of the closed characteristics must be irrationally elliptic, i.e., each of them possesses four Floquet multipliers with two 1's and the other two locate on the unit circle with rotation angles being irrational multiples of π.

Remark 1.3. Using Theorem 1.1, and the proof of Theorem 1.4 of [LLo1] or the proof of Theorem 1.1 of [Vit2], we obtain the following immediately:

In the C^∞ topology, the following holds for a generic $\Sigma \in \mathcal{SH}_{st}(2n)$: the problem (1.1) has infinitely many prime symmetric closed characteristics, or all the symmetric closed characteristics on Σ are hyperbolic.

Note that for a $\Sigma \in \mathcal{SH}_{st}(2n) \setminus \mathcal{SH}_{con}(2n)$, we are not aware of any results concerning the existence of at least two elliptic closed characteristics without pinching or non-degeneracy condition. Thus motivated by result of [Lon2], we prove the following result as an application of Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $\Sigma \in \mathcal{SH}_{st}(4)$ satisfy ${}^{\#}\mathcal{T}(\Sigma) = 2$. Then both of the closed characteristics must be elliptic.*

Remark 1.5. Note that the symmetric condition on Σ in Theorem 1.4 is specially used to get a contradiction in the study of the Subcase 1.2 of Case 1 in the proof of Theorem 1.4, where we used Theorem 1.1 to get the identity (6.36) and then to get the estimate (6.38) below.

Besides the resonance identities established in [LLW1] and our Theorem 1.1, the other main ingredients in the proof of Theorem 1.4 are: Morse inequality, and the index iteration theory developed by Long and his coworkers, specially the precise iteration formulae of the Maslov-type

index theory for any symplectic path which is established by Long in [Lon2] and the common index jump theorem of Long and Zhu (Theorem 4.3 of [LoZ1]).

This paper is arranged as follows. In Sections 2-4, we give first a proof for Theorem 1.1, and then in Section 5 we briefly review the equivariant Morse theory and the resonance identities for closed characteristics on compact star-shaped hypersurfaces in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$ developed in [LLW1]. The proof of Theorem 1.4 will be given in Section 6.

In this paper, let $\mathbf{N}$, $\mathbf{N}_0$, $\mathbf{Z}$, $\mathbf{Q}$, $\mathbf{R}$, and $\mathbf{R}^+$ denote the sets of natural integers, non-negative integers, integers, rational numbers, real numbers, and positive real numbers respectively. We define the function $[a] = \max\{k \in \mathbf{Z} \mid k \le a\}$, $\{a\} = a - [a]$, and $E(a) = \min\{k \in \mathbf{Z} \mid k \ge a\}$. Denote by $a \cdot b$ and $|a|$ the standard inner product and norm in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$. Denote by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and $\| \cdot \|$ the standard L^2 inner product and L^2 norm. For an S^1-space X, we denote by X_{S^1} the homotopy quotient of X by S^1, i.e., $X_{S^1} = S^\infty \times_{S^1} X$, where S^∞ is the unit sphere in an infinite dimensional *complex* Hilbert space. In this paper we use $\mathbf{Q}$ coefficients for all homological and cohomological modules. By $t \to a^+$, we mean $t > a$ and $t \to a$.

2 Critical point theory for symmetric closed characteristics

Firstly, we briefly review the variational construction of closed characteristics on starshaped hypersurfaces established in [LLW1]. Now we fix a $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{st}(2n)$ and assume the following condition on $\mathcal{T}(\Sigma)$:

(F) **There exist only finitely many geometrically distinct prime closed characteristics $\{(\sigma_j, z_j)\}_{1 \le j \le k'}$ on Σ.**

Let $\hat{\sigma} = \inf_{1 \le j \le k'} \sigma_j$ and T be a fixed positive constant. Then by Section 2 of [LLW1], for any $a > \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{T}$, we can construct a function $\varphi_a \in C^\infty(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}^+)$ which has 0 as its unique critical point in $[0, +\infty)$. Moreover, $\frac{\varphi'(t)}{t}$ is strictly decreasing for $t > 0$ together with $\varphi(0) = 0 = \varphi'(0)$ and $\varphi''(0) = 1 = \lim_{t \to 0^+} \frac{\varphi'(t)}{t}$. More precisely, we define φ_a and the Hamiltonian function $\widetilde{H}_a(x) = a\varphi_a(j(x))$ via Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.4 in [LLW1]. The precise dependence of φ_a on a is explained in Remark 2.3 of [LLW1].

For technical reasons we want to further modify the Hamiltonian, we define the new Hamiltonian function H_a via Proposition 2.5 of [LLW1] and consider the fixed period problem

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) &= JH_a'(x(t)), \\ x(0) &= x(T). \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

Then $H_a \in C^3(\mathbf{R}^{2n} \setminus \{0\}, \mathbf{R}) \cap C^1(\mathbf{R}^{2n}, \mathbf{R})$. Solutions of (2.1) are $x \equiv 0$ and $x = \rho z(\sigma t/T)$ with $\frac{\varphi_a'(\rho)}{\rho} = \frac{\sigma}{aT}$, where (σ, z) is a solution of (1.1). In particular, non-zero solutions of (2.1) are in one to one correspondence with solutions of (1.1) with period $\sigma < aT$.

For any $a > \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{T}$, we can choose some large constant $K = K(a)$ such that

$$H_{a,K}(x) = H_a(x) + \frac{1}{2}K|x|^2 \tag{2.2}$$

is a strictly convex function, that is,

$$(\nabla H_{a,K}(x) - \nabla H_{a,K}(y), x - y) \geq \frac{\epsilon}{2}|x - y|^2, \tag{2.3}$$

for all $x, y \in \mathbf{R}^{2n}$, and some positive ϵ. Let $H_{a,K}^*$ be the Fenchel dual of $H_{a,K}$ defined by

$$H_{a,K}^*(y) = \sup\{x \cdot y - H_{a,K}(x) \mid x \in \mathbf{R}^{2n}\}.$$

The dual action functional on $X = W^{1,2}(\mathbf{R}/T\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{R}^{2n})$ is defined by

$$F_{a,K}(x) = \int_0^T \left[\frac{1}{2}(J\dot{x} - Kx, x) + H_{a,K}^*(-J\dot{x} + Kx)\right] dt. \tag{2.4}$$

Then $F_{a,K} \in C^{1,1}(X, \mathbf{R})$ and for $KT \notin 2\pi\mathbf{Z}$, $F_{a,K}$ satisfies the Palais-Smale condition and x is a critical point of $F_{a,K}$ if and only if it is a solution of (2.1). Moreover, $F_{a,K}(x_a) < 0$ and it is independent of K for every critical point $x_a \neq 0$ of $F_{a,K}$.

When $KT \notin 2\pi\mathbf{Z}$, the map $x \mapsto -J\dot{x} + Kx$ is a Hilbert space isomorphism between $X = W^{1,2}(\mathbf{R}/T\mathbf{Z}; \mathbf{R}^{2n})$ and $E = L^2(\mathbf{R}/(T\mathbf{Z}), \mathbf{R}^{2n})$. We denote its inverse by M_K and the functional

$$\Psi_{a,K}(u) = \int_0^T \left[-\frac{1}{2}(M_K u, u) + H_{a,K}^*(u)\right] dt, \qquad \forall\, u \in E. \tag{2.5}$$

Then $x \in X$ is a critical point of $F_{a,K}$ if and only if $u = -J\dot{x} + Kx$ is a critical point of $\Psi_{a,K}$.

Suppose u is a nonzero critical point of $\Psi_{a,K}$. Then the formal Hessian of $\Psi_{a,K}$ at u is defined by

$$Q_{a,K}(v) = \int_0^T (-M_K v \cdot v + H_{a,K}^{*\prime\prime}(u)v \cdot v)dt, \tag{2.6}$$

which defines an orthogonal splitting $E = E_- \oplus E_0 \oplus E_+$ of E into negative, zero and positive subspaces. The index and nullity of u are defined by $i_K(u) = \dim E_-$ and $\nu_K(u) = \dim E_0$ respectively. Similarly, we define the index and nullity of $x = M_K u$ for $F_{a,K}$, we denote them by $i_K(x)$ and $\nu_K(x)$. Then we have

$$i_K(u) = i_K(x), \quad \nu_K(u) = \nu_K(x), \tag{2.7}$$

which follow from the definitions (2.4) and (2.5). The following important formula was proved in Lemma 6.4 of [Vit2]:

$$i_K(x) = 2n([KT/2\pi] + 1) + i^v(x) \equiv d(K) + i^v(x), \tag{2.8}$$

where the index $i^v(x)$ does not depend on K, but only on H_a. By Theorem 6.1 below, we know $i^v(x) = i(x) - n$, where $i(x)$ is the Maslov-type index of the fundamental solution of the system (2.9) below(cf. Section 5.4 and Chapter 8 of [Lon3]).

By the proof of Proposition 2 of [Vit1], we have that $v \in E$ belongs to the null space of $Q_{a,K}$ if and only if $z = M_K v$ is a solution of the linearized system

$$\dot{z}(t) = JH_a''(x(t))z(t). \tag{2.9}$$

Thus the nullity in (2.7) is independent of K, which we denote by $\nu^v(x) \equiv \nu_K(u) = \nu_K(x)$.

By Proposition 2.11 of [LLW1], the index $i^v(x)$ and nullity $\nu^v(x)$ coincide with those defined for the Hamiltonian $H(x) = j(x)^\alpha$ for all $x \in \mathbf{R}^{2n}$ and some $\alpha \in (1, 2)$. Especially $1 \le \nu^v(x_b) \le 2n - 1$ always holds.

We have a natural S^1-action on X or E defined by

$$\theta \cdot u(t) = u(\theta + t), \quad \forall\, \theta \in S^1,\, t \in \mathbf{R}. \tag{2.10}$$

Clearly both of $F_{a,K}$ and $\Psi_{a,K}$ are S^1-invariant. For any $\kappa \in \mathbf{R}$, we denote by

$$\Lambda_{a,K}^\kappa = \{u \in L^2(\mathbf{R}/T\mathbf{Z}; \mathbf{R}^{2n}) \mid \Psi_{a,K}(u) \le \kappa\}, \tag{2.11}$$

$$X_{a,K}^\kappa = \{x \in W^{1,2}(\mathbf{R}/(T\mathbf{Z}), \mathbf{R}^{2n}) \mid F_{a,K}(x) \le \kappa\}. \tag{2.12}$$

For a critical point u of $\Psi_{a,K}$ and the corresponding $x = M_K u$ of $F_{a,K}$, let

$$\Lambda_{a,K}(u) = \Lambda_{a,K}^{\Psi_{a,K}(u)} = \{w \in L^2(\mathbf{R}/(T\mathbf{Z}), \mathbf{R}^{2n}) \mid \Psi_{a,K}(w) \le \Psi_{a,K}(u)\}, \tag{2.13}$$

$$X_{a,K}(x) = X_{a,K}^{F_{a,K}(x)} = \{y \in W^{1,2}(\mathbf{R}/(T\mathbf{Z}), \mathbf{R}^{2n}) \mid F_{a,K}(y) \le F_{a,K}(x)\}. \tag{2.14}$$

Clearly, both sets are S^1-invariant. Denote by $\mathrm{crit}(\Psi_{a,K})$ the set of critical points of $\Psi_{a,K}$. Because $\Psi_{a,K}$ is S^1-invariant, $S^1 \cdot u$ becomes a critical orbit if $u \in \mathrm{crit}(\Psi_{a,K})$.

In the following, we construct a variational structure of symmetric closed characteristics. In sections 2-4, we fix first a $\Sigma \in \mathcal{SH}_{st}(2n)$ and assume the following condition on $\mathcal{T}_s(\Sigma)$:

(F') **There exist only finitely many geometrically distinct prime symmetric closed characteristics $\{(\tau_j, y_j)\}_{1 \le j \le k}$ on Σ.**

Note that (τ, y) is some odd iteration of a prime symmetric closed characteristic if and only if it satisfies the problem

$$\begin{cases} \dot{y}(t) = JN_\Sigma(y(t)), y(t) \in \Sigma, \forall\, t \in \mathbf{R}, \\ y(\tau/2) = -y(0). \end{cases} \tag{2.15}$$

As Definition 2.1 of [LLo1] we introduce the following discrete subset of $\mathbf{R}^+$:

Definition 2.1. *Under the assumption (F), the set of periods of symmetric closed characteristics on Σ is defined by*

$$\mathrm{per}(\Sigma) = \{(2m-1)\tau_j \mid m \in \mathbf{N}, 1 \le j \le k\}.$$

Note that in the above definition, the period set $\mathrm{per}(\Sigma)$ is defined only via odd iterations of (τ_j, y_j), because even iterate $(2m\tau_j, y_j)$ does not satisfy the equation (2.15) and does not yield any critical point of $\bar{F}_{a,K}$ on the space $\bar{X}$ via Proposition 2.4 and Lemma 2.5.

Now we construct a variational structure of symmetric closed characteristics as the following.

Lemma 2.2.(cf. Lemma 2.2 of [LLW1]) *For any sufficiently small $\vartheta \in (0,1)$, there exists a function $\varphi \equiv \varphi_\vartheta \in C^\infty(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}^+)$ depending on ϑ which has 0 as its unique critical point in $[0, +\infty)$ such that the following hold.*

(i) $\varphi(0) = 0 = \varphi'(0)$, and $\varphi''(0) = 1 = \lim_{t\to 0^+} \frac{\varphi'(t)}{t}$;

(ii) $\frac{d}{dt}\left(\frac{\varphi'(t)}{t}\right) < 0$ for $t > 0$, and $\lim_{t\to+\infty} \frac{\varphi'(t)}{t} < \vartheta$; that is, $\frac{\varphi'(t)}{t}$ is strictly decreasing for $t > 0$;

(iii) In particular, we can choose $\alpha \in (1,2)$ sufficiently close to 2 and $c \in (0,1)$ such that $\varphi(t) = ct^\alpha$ whenever $\frac{\varphi'(t)}{t} \in [\vartheta, 1-\vartheta]$ and $t > 0$.

Let $j : \mathbf{R}^{2n} \to \mathbf{R}$ be the gauge function of Σ, i.e., $j(\lambda x) = \lambda$ for $x \in \Sigma$ and $\lambda \ge 0$, then $j \in C^3(\mathbf{R}^{2n} \setminus \{0\}, \mathbf{R}) \cap C^0(\mathbf{R}^{2n}, \mathbf{R})$ and $\Sigma = j^{-1}(1)$. Denote by $\hat{\tau} = \inf\{s \mid s \in \mathrm{per}(\Sigma)\}$.

By the same proofs of Lemma 2.4 and Proposition 2.5 of [LLW1], we have

Lemma 2.3. *Let $a > \frac{\hat{\tau}}{T}$, $\vartheta_a \in (0, \frac{\hat{\tau}}{aT})$ and φ_a be a C^∞ function associated to ϑ_a satisfying (i)-(ii) of Lemma 2.2. Define the Hamiltonian function $\widetilde{H}_a(x) = a\varphi_a(j(x))$ and consider the fixed period system*

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) &= J\widetilde{H}'_a(x(t)), \\ x(T/2) &= -x(0). \end{cases} \tag{2.16}$$

Then solutions of (2.16) are $x \equiv 0$ and $x = \rho y(\tau t/T)$ with $\frac{\varphi'_a(\rho)}{\rho} = \frac{\tau}{aT}$, where (τ, y) is a solution of (2.15). In particular, non-zero solutions of (2.16) are in one to one correspondence with solutions of (2.15) with period $\tau < aT$.

Proposition 2.4. *For $a > \frac{\hat{\tau}}{T}$ and small ϵ_a, we choose small enough ϑ_a such that Lemma 2.3 holds. Then there exists a function $\bar{H}_a$ on $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$ such that $\bar{H}_a(x) = \bar{H}_a(-x)$ for all $x \in \mathbf{R}^{2n}$, $\bar{H}_a$*

is C^1 on $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$, and C^3 on $\mathbf{R}^{2n}\setminus\{0\}$, $\bar{H}_a=\widetilde{H}_a$ in $U_A\equiv\{x\mid \widetilde{H}_a(x)\le A\}$ for some large A, and $\bar{H}_a(x)=\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_a|x|^2$ for $|x|$ large, and the solutions of the fixed period system

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) &= J\bar{H}_a'(x(t)), \\ x(T/2) &= -x(0), \end{cases} \tag{2.17}$$

are the same with those of (2.16).

As in [BLMR] (cf. Section 3 of [Vit2]), for any $a>\frac{\hat{\tau}}{T}$, we can choose some large constant $K=K(a)$ such that

$$\bar{H}_{a,K}(x)=\bar{H}_a(x)+\frac{1}{2}K|x|^2 \tag{2.18}$$

is a strictly convex function, that is,

$$(\nabla\bar{H}_{a,K}(x)-\nabla\bar{H}_{a,K}(y),x-y)\ge\frac{\epsilon}{2}|x-y|^2, \tag{2.19}$$

for all $x,y\in\mathbf{R}^{2n}$, and some positive ϵ. Let $\bar{H}^*_{a,K}$ be the Fenchel dual of $\bar{H}_{a,K}$ defined by

$$\bar{H}^*_{a,K}(y)=\sup\{x\cdot y-\bar{H}_{a,K}(x)\mid x\in\mathbf{R}^{2n}\}. \tag{2.20}$$

Since $\bar{H}_a(x)=\bar{H}_a(-x)$ for all $x\in\mathbf{R}^{2n}$, then $\bar{H}_{a,K}(x)=\bar{H}_{a,K}(-x)$ and $\bar{H}^*_{a,K}(x)=\bar{H}^*_{a,K}(-x)$ for all $x\in\mathbf{R}^{2n}$ by (2.18) and (2.20) respectively.

The dual action functional on $\bar{X}=W^{1,2}_s(\mathbf{R}/T\mathbf{Z},\mathbf{R}^{2n})=\{x\in W^{1,2}(\mathbf{R}/T\mathbf{Z},\mathbf{R}^{2n})\mid x(t+T/2)=-x(t),\forall t\in\mathbf{R}\}$ is defined by

$$\bar{F}_{a,K}(x)=\int_0^{T/2}\left[\frac{1}{2}(J\dot{x}-Kx,x)+\bar{H}^*_{a,K}(-J\dot{x}+Kx)\right]dt. \tag{2.21}$$

Then $\bar{F}_{a,K}\in C^{1,1}(\bar{X},\mathbf{R})$ holds by the same argument in the proof of (3.16) of [Vit2], but $\bar{F}_{a,K}$ is not C^2.

Lemma 2.5. *Assume $\frac{KT}{2\pi}\notin 2\mathbf{Z}-1$, then x is a critical point of $\bar{F}_{a,K}$ if and only if it is a solution of (2.17).*

Proof. Noticing that when $\frac{KT}{2\pi}\notin 2\mathbf{Z}-1$, the map $x\mapsto -J\dot{x}+Kx$ is a Hilbert space isomorphism between $\bar{X}=W^{1,2}_s(\mathbf{R}/T\mathbf{Z};\mathbf{R}^{2n})$ and $\bar{E}=L^2_s(\mathbf{R}/(T\mathbf{Z}),\mathbf{R}^{2n})=\{u\in L^2(\mathbf{R}/(T\mathbf{Z}),\mathbf{R}^{2n})\mid u(t+T/2)=-u(t),a.e.t\in\mathbf{R}\}$. Then the lemma follows by direct computation. cf. Proposition 3.4 of [Vit2]. ∎

From Lemma 2.5, we know that the critical points of $\bar{F}_{a,K}$ are independent of K.

Proposition 2.6. *For every critical point $x_a\neq 0$ of $\bar{F}_{a,K}$, the critical value $\bar{F}_{a,K}(x_a)<0$ holds and is independent of K.*

Proof. Since $\nabla \bar{H}_{a,K}(x_a) = -J\dot{x}_a + Kx_a$, then we have

$$\bar{H}^*_{a,K}(-J\dot{x}_a + Kx_a) = (-J\dot{x}_a + Kx_a, x_a) - \bar{H}_{a,K}(x_a).$$

Thus we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{F}_{a,K}(x_a) &= \int_0^{\frac{T}{2}} \left[\frac{1}{2}(J\dot{x}_a - Kx_a, x_a) + \bar{H}^*_{a,K}(-J\dot{x}_a + Kx_a)\right] dt \\
&= \int_0^{\frac{T}{2}} \left[-\frac{1}{2}(J\dot{x}_a - Kx_a, x_a) - \bar{H}_{a,K}(x_a)\right] dt \\
&= \int_0^{\frac{T}{2}} \left[-\frac{1}{2}(J\dot{x}_a, x_a) - \bar{H}(x_a)\right] dt \\
&= \int_0^{\frac{T}{2}} \left[\frac{1}{2}(\bar{H}'_a(x_a), x_a) - \bar{H}(x_a)\right] dt. \qquad (2.22)
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.3 and Proposition 2.4, we have $x_a = \rho_a y(\tau t/T)$ with $\frac{\varphi'_a(\rho_a)}{\rho_a} = \frac{\tau}{aT}$. Hence, we have

$$\bar{F}_{a,K}(x_a) = \frac{1}{4}a\varphi'_a(\rho_a)\rho_a T - \frac{1}{2}a\varphi_a(\rho_a)T. \qquad (2.23)$$

Here we used the facts that $j'(y) = N_\Sigma(y)$ and $j'(y) \cdot y = 1$.

Let $f(t) = \frac{1}{4}a\varphi'_a(t)t - \frac{1}{2}a\varphi_a(t)$ for $t \geq 0$. Then we have $f(0) = 0$ and $f'(t) = \frac{a}{4}(\varphi''_a(t)t - \varphi'_a(t)) < 0$ since $\frac{d}{dt}(\frac{\varphi'_a(t)}{t}) < 0$ by (ii) of Lemma 2.2. Together with (2.23), it yields the proposition. ∎

We know that when $\frac{KT}{2\pi} \notin 2\mathbf{Z} - 1$, the map $x \mapsto -J\dot{x} + Kx$ is a Hilbert space isomorphism between $\bar{X} = W^{1,2}_s(\mathbf{R}/T\mathbf{Z}; \mathbf{R}^{2n})$ and $\bar{E} = L^2_s(\mathbf{R}/(T\mathbf{Z}), \mathbf{R}^{2n})$. We denote its inverse by $\bar{M}_K$ and the functional

$$\bar{\Psi}_{a,K}(u) = \int_0^{\frac{T}{2}} \left[-\frac{1}{2}(\bar{M}_K u, u) + \bar{H}^*_{a,K}(u)\right] dt, \qquad \forall\, u \in \bar{E}. \qquad (2.24)$$

Then $x \in \bar{X}$ is a critical point of $\bar{F}_{a,K}$ if and only if $u = -J\dot{x} + Kx$ is a critical point of $\bar{\Psi}_{a,K}$. We have a natural S^1-action on $\bar{X}$ or $\bar{E}$ defined by

$$\theta \cdot x(t) = x(\theta + t), \quad \forall\, \theta \in S^1,\, t \in \mathbf{R}. \qquad (2.25)$$

Then we have the functionals $\bar{F}_{a,K}$, $\bar{\Psi}_{a,K}$ are S^1-invariant and are even by the eveness of $\bar{H}^*_{a,K}(x)$ on $\bar{X}$. cf. Lemma 2.3 of [Wan3].

For any $\kappa \in \mathbf{R}$, we denote by

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\Lambda}^\kappa_{a,K} &= \{u \in \bar{E} \mid \bar{\Psi}_{a,K}(u) \leq \kappa\}, \qquad (2.26) \\
\bar{X}^\kappa_{a,K} &= \{x \in \bar{X} \mid \bar{F}_{a,K}(x) \leq \kappa\}, \qquad (2.27)
\end{aligned}$$

which are S^1-invariant.

Definition 2.7. *Suppose u is a nonzero critical point of $\bar{\Psi}_{a,K}$. Then the formal Hessian of $\bar{\Psi}_{a,K}$ at u is defined by*

$$\bar{Q}_{a,K}(v) = \int_0^{\frac{T}{2}} (-\bar{M}_K v \cdot v + \bar{H}''^*_{a,K}(u)v \cdot v)dt, \tag{2.28}$$

which defines an orthogonal splitting $\bar{E} = \bar{E}_- \oplus \bar{E}_0 \oplus \bar{E}_+$ of $\bar{E}$ into negative, zero and positive subspaces. The index and nullity of u are defined by $\bar{i}_K(u) = \dim \bar{E}_-$ and $\bar{\nu}_K(u) = \dim \bar{E}_0$ respectively.

Similarly, we define the index and nullity of $x = \bar{M}_K u$ for $\bar{F}_{a,K}$ respectively by

$$\bar{i}_K(x) = \bar{i}_K(u), \quad \bar{\nu}_K(x) = \bar{\nu}_K(u), \tag{2.29}$$

which follow from the definitions (2.21) and (2.24).

By the same proof of Proposition 2 of [Vit1], we have that $v \in \bar{E}$ belongs to the null space of $\bar{Q}_{a,K}$ if and only if $z = \bar{M}_K v$ is a solution of the linearized system

$$\begin{cases} \dot{z}(t) = J\bar{H}''_a(x(t))z(t), \\ z(\frac{T}{2}) = -z(0). \end{cases} \tag{2.30}$$

Thus the nullity in (2.28) is independent of K, which we denote by $\bar{\nu}(x) \equiv \bar{\nu}_K(u) = \bar{\nu}_K(x)$.

Suppose u is a nonzero critical point of $\bar{\Psi}_{a,K}$ such that u corresponds to a critical point $x = \bar{M}_K u$ of $\bar{F}_{a,K}$. Then for any $\omega = -1, 1$ and $k = 1, 2$, we define the quadratic form

$$Q^{\omega}_{\frac{kT}{2}}(v) = \int_0^{\frac{kT}{2}} (-\bar{M}_K v \cdot v + \bar{H}''^*_{a,K}(u)v \cdot v)dt$$

on $E^{\omega}_{\frac{kT}{2}} = \{u \in L^2(\mathbf{R}/(T\mathbf{Z}), \mathbf{R}^{2n}) \mid u(t + \frac{kT}{2}) = \omega u(t), a.e.t \in \mathbf{R}\}$, we denote its index by $i^{\omega}_{K,\frac{kT}{2}}(u)$. Then we have

$$\bar{i}_K(u) = i^{-1}_{K,\frac{T}{2}}(u). \tag{2.31}$$

By the same proof of Corollary 1.5.4 of [Eke2], we obtain

$$i^1_{K,T}(u) = i^1_{K,\frac{T}{2}}(u) + i^{-1}_{K,\frac{T}{2}}(u). \tag{2.32}$$

Consider the linear Hamiltonian system

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\xi}(t) = JA_a(t)\xi, \qquad \text{for } 0 \le t \le T/2, \\ A_a(T/2) = A_a(0), \end{cases} \tag{2.33}$$

where $A_a(t) = \bar{H}''_a(x(t))$. Let $\psi_x : [0, T/2] \to \mathrm{Sp}(2n)$ with $\psi_x(0) = I_{2n}$ be the fundamental solution of (2.33). Denote by $i(A_a, k) \equiv i(\psi_x, k)$ and $\nu(A_a, k) \equiv \nu(\psi_x, k)$ the Maslov-type index and nullity of the k-th iteration of the system (2.33) (cf. Section 5.4 and Chapter 8 of [Lon3]).

Then from Lemma 6.4 of [Vit2] and Theorem 2.1 of [HuL1], we have

$$i^1_{K,\frac{kT}{2}}(u) = 2n([K\frac{kT}{4\pi}]+1) + i(A_a,k) - n. \tag{2.34}$$

In the following we set $e(K) = 2n([K\frac{T}{2\pi}] - [K\frac{T}{4\pi}])$.

Theorem 2.8. *Suppose u is a nonzero critical point of $\bar{\Psi}_{a,K}$ such that u corresponds to a critical point $x = \bar{M}_K u$ of $\bar{F}_{a,K}$. Then we have*

$$\bar{i}_K(u) = \bar{i}_K(x) = e(K) + i_{-1}(A_a,1), \;\; \bar{\nu}_K(u) = \bar{\nu}_K(x) = \nu_{-1}(A_a,1), \tag{2.35}$$

where $i_{-1}(A_a,1) \equiv i_{-1}(\psi_x)$ and $\nu_{-1}(A_a,1) \equiv \nu_{-1}(\psi_x)$ are the Maslov-type index and nullity introduced in Definition 5.4.3 of [Lon3] for $\omega = -1$. They depend only on a, and are independent of K. In the following, we also denote them by $i_{-1}(x)$ and $\nu_{-1}(x)$ respectively.

Proof. From (2.29), (2.31), (2.32), (2.34), it follows that

$$\bar{i}_K(u) = \bar{i}_K(x) = e(K) + i(A_a,2) - i(A_a,1). \tag{2.36}$$

By the Bott-type formulae (cf. Theorem 9.2.1 of [Lon3]), we have

$$i(A_a,2) = i(A_a,1) + i_{-1}(A_a,1). \tag{2.37}$$

Thus the former in (2.35) holds by (2.36) and (2.37). The latter in (2.35) follows from (2.30). ∎

Lemma 2.9. *There is an S^1-invariant subspace V of $\bar{X} = W^{1,2}_s(\mathbf{R}/T\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{R}^{2n})$ such that $\bar{F}_{a,K}$ is bounded from below on V and $\bar{F}_{a,K}(z)$ goes to minus infinity as $\|z\|$ goes to infinity on $V^\perp$, where $codim V = e(K)$, $e(K) = 2n([K\frac{T}{2\pi}] - [K\frac{T}{4\pi}])$.*

Proof. Define the quadratic form A by

$$A(z) = \int_0^{T/2} \left[(J\dot{z} - Kz, z) + \frac{1}{K+\epsilon}|-J\dot{z} + Kz|^2 \right] dt.$$

and take for $V^\perp$ the space generated by the eigenvectors associated with negative eigenvalues.

Let $z(t) = \sum_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \exp{(\frac{2\pi}{T}(2k-1)Jt)z_k}$ be the Fourier decomposition of z. Then

$$A(z) = \sum_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{((4k-2)\pi - \epsilon T)((4k-2)\pi + KT)}{2(K+\epsilon)T^2}|z_k|^2, \tag{2.38}$$

and the codimension of V is given by $2n\,\#\{k \in \mathbf{Z} \mid -KT < (4k-2)\pi < \epsilon T\} = e(K)$. Hence by the same proof of Lemma 5.2 of [Vit2], our lemma follows. ∎

Because $\bar{X}$ is S^1-equivariantly homotopic to the single point 0 in itself, as in the proof of the identity (5.3) of [LLo1], by Lemma 2.9 and the method of Corollary 5.11 of [Vit2] we obtain the

following result on the global equivariant homological structure of $(\bar{X}, \bar{X}^{-\infty})$, which will be used in the proof of the identity (4.5) below.

Corollary 2.10. *$H^q_{S^1}(\bar{X}, \bar{X}^{-\infty}) \simeq H^{q-e(K)}(CP^\infty)$ (which is one dimensional for all even $q \geq e(K)$, and $\{0\}$ otherwise).*

In this paper, we say that $\bar{\Psi}_{a,K}$ with $a \in [a_1, a_2]$ form a continuous family of functionals in the sense of Remark 2.6 of [LLW1], when $0 < a_1 < a_2 < +\infty$.

Lemma 2.11. *For any $0 < a_1 < a_2 < +\infty$, let K be fixed so that $\bar{\Psi}_{a,K}$ with $a \in [a_1, a_2]$ is a continuous family of functionals defined by (2.24) satisfying (2.19) with the same $\epsilon > 0$. Then there exist a finite dimensional S^1-invariant subspace $\bar{G}$ of $\bar{E} = L^2_s(\mathbf{R}/(T\mathbf{Z}), \mathbf{R}^{2n})$ and a family of S^1-equivariant maps $\bar{h}_a : \bar{G} \to \bar{G}^\perp$ such that the following hold.*

(i) For $g \in \bar{G}$, each function $h \mapsto \bar{\Psi}_{a,K}(g+h)$ has $\bar{h}_a(g)$ as the unique minimum in $\bar{G}^\perp$.

Let $\bar{\psi}_{a,K}(g) = \bar{\Psi}_{a,K}(g + \bar{h}_a(g))$. Then we have

(ii) Each $\bar{\psi}_{a,K}$ is C^1 and S^1-invariant on $\bar{G}$. Here g_a is a critical point of $\bar{\psi}_{a,K}$ if and only if $g_a + \bar{h}_a(g_a)$ is a critical point of $\bar{\Psi}_{a,K}$.

(iii) If $g_a \in \bar{G}$ and $\bar{H}_a$ is C^k with $k \geq 2$ in a neighborhood of the trajectory of $g_a + \bar{h}_a(g_a)$, then $\bar{\psi}_{a,K}$ is C^{k-1} in a neighborhood of g_a. In particular, if g_a is a nonzero critical point of $\bar{\psi}_{a,K}$, then $\bar{\psi}_{a,K}$ is C^2 in a neighborhood of the critical orbit $S^1 \cdot g_a$. The index and nullity of $\bar{\Psi}_{a,K}$ at $g_a + \bar{h}_a(g_a)$ defined in Definition 2.7 coincide with the Morse index and nullity of $\bar{\psi}_{a,K}$ at g_a.

(iv) For any $\kappa \in \mathbf{R}$, we denote by

$$\widetilde{\bar{\Lambda}}^\kappa_{a,K} = \{g \in \bar{G} \mid \bar{\psi}_{a,K}(g) \leq \kappa\}. \tag{2.39}$$

Then the natural embedding $\widetilde{\bar{\Lambda}}^\kappa_{a,K} \hookrightarrow \bar{\Lambda}^\kappa_{a,K}$ given by $g \mapsto g + \bar{h}_a(g)$ is an S^1-equivariant homotopy equivalence.

(v) The functionals $a \mapsto \bar{\psi}_{a,K}$ is continuous in a in the C^1 topology. Moreover $a \mapsto \bar{\psi}''_{a,K}$ is continuous in a neighborhood of the critical orbit $S^1 \cdot g_a$.

Proof. Let $x(t) = e^{JLt}x_0$ for some $\frac{LT}{2\pi} \in 2\mathbf{Z} - 1$ and $x_0 \in \mathbf{R}^{2n}$, then $-J\dot{x} + Kx = (L+K)x$. Thus $\{-\frac{1}{L+K} \mid \frac{LT}{2\pi} \in 2\mathbf{Z} - 1\}$ is the set of all the eigenvalues of $-\bar{M}_K$. By the convexity of $\bar{H}^*_{a,K}$, we have

$$(\bar{H}^{*\prime}_{a,K}(u) - \bar{H}^{*\prime}_{a,K}(v), u - v) \geq \omega|u - v|^2, \quad \forall\, a \in [a_1, a_2],\ u, v \in \mathbf{R}^{2n}, \tag{2.40}$$

for some $\omega > 0$. Hence we can use the proof of Proposition 3.9 of [Vit2] to obtain the subspace $\bar{G}$ and the map $\bar{h}_a$. In fact, Let $\bar{G}$ be the subspace of $L^2_s(\mathbf{R}/(T\mathbf{Z}); \mathbf{R}^{2n})$ generated by the eigenvectors of $-\bar{M}_K$ whose eigenvalues are less than $-\frac{\omega}{2}$, i.e.,

$$\bar{G} = span\{e^{JLt}x_0 \mid -\frac{1}{L+K} < -\frac{\omega}{2}, \frac{LT}{2\pi} \in 2\mathbf{Z} - 1, x_0 \in \mathbf{R}^{2n}\},$$

and $\bar{h}_a(g)$ is defined by the equation

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial h}\bar{\Psi}_{a,K}(g+\bar{h}_a(g))=0. \tag{2.41}$$

Then (i)-(iii) follow from Proposition 3.9 of [Vit2], and (iv) follows from Lemma 5.1 of [Vit2], the proof of (v) is the same as that of Lemma 2.10 (v) of [LLW1]. ∎

Proposition 2.12. *For all $b \geq a > \frac{\tau}{T}$, let $\bar{F}_{b,K}$ be the functional defined by (2.21), and x_b be the critical point of $\bar{F}_{b,K}$ so that x_b corresponds to a fixed symmetric closed characteristic (τ, y) on Σ for all $b \geq a$. Then the index $i_{-1}(A_b, 1)$ and nullity $\nu_{-1}(A_b, 1)$ are constants for all $b \geq a$. In particular, when $\bar{H}_b$ is α-homogenous for some $\alpha \in (1, 2)$ near the image set of x_b, the index and nullity coincide with those defined for the Hamiltonian $\bar{H}(x) = j(x)^\alpha$ for all $x \in \mathbf{R}^{2n}$. Especially $1 \leq \nu_{-1}(A_b, 1) \leq 2n-1$ always holds.*

Proof. Denote by $R(t)$ the fundamental solution of the linearized system (2.33) satisfying $R(0) = I_{2n}$. Then by Lemma 1.6.11 of [Eke2], whose proof does not need the convexity of Σ, we have

$$R(t)T_{y(0)}\Sigma \subset T_{y(\tau t/T)}\Sigma. \tag{2.42}$$

Then the completely same argument of Proposition 2.9 of [LLo1] proves that $\nu_{-1}(A_a, 1)$ is constant for all $\bar{H}_a$ satisfying Proposition 2.4 with $a > \frac{\tau}{T}$ and $1 \leq \nu_{-1}(A_a, 1) \leq 2n-1$.

For any $b > a > \frac{\tau}{T}$, by (iii) of Lemma 2.2, we can construct a continuous family of $\bar{\Psi}_{c,K}$ with $c \in [a, b]$ such that $\bar{H}_b$ is homogenous of degree $\alpha = \alpha_b$ near the image set of x_b. Now we can use Lemma 2.11 (v) to obtain a continuous family of $\bar{\psi}_{c,K}$ such that $\bar{\psi}''_{c,K}(g_c)$ depends continuously on $c \in [a, b]$, where g_c is the critical point of $\bar{\psi}_{c,K}$ corresponding to $\bar{M}_K^{-1}x_c$. Because $\dim\ker\bar{\psi}''_{c,K}(g_c) = \bar{\nu}_K(\bar{M}_K^{-1}x_c) = \nu_{-1}(A_c, 1) = \text{constant}$, the index of $\bar{\psi}''_{c,K}(g_c) = \bar{i}_K(\bar{M}_K^{-1}x_c) = i_{-1}(A_c, 1) + e(K)$ must be constant too. Thus $i_{-1}(A_b, 1)$ is constant for all $b \geq a$. Note that here we used (2.29), (2.35), and Lemma 2.11 (iii). Since the index $i_{-1}(A_b, 1)$ and nullity $\nu_{-1}(A_b, 1)$ only depend on the value of $\bar{H}_b$ near the image set of x_b, then the index and nullity coincide with those defined for the Hamiltonian $\bar{H}(x) = j(x)^\alpha$, $\forall\ x \in \mathbf{R}^{2n}$. The proof is complete. ∎

By Proposition 4.1 of [Vit2] and Lemma 2.11, using the same proof of Proposition 2.12 of [LLW1], we also have:

Proposition 2.13. *$\bar{\Psi}_{a,K}$ satisfies the Palais-Smale condition on $\bar{E}$, and $\bar{F}_{a,K}$ satisfies the Palais-Smale condition on $\bar{X}$, when $\frac{KT}{2\pi} \notin 2\mathbf{Z} - 1$.*

Now for a critical point u of $\bar{\Psi}_{a,K}$ and the corresponding $x = \bar{M}_K u$ of $\bar{F}_{a,K}$, let

$$\bar{\Lambda}_{a,K}(u) = \bar{\Lambda}_{a,K}^{\bar{\Psi}_{a,K}(u)} = \{w \in L_s^2(\mathbf{R}/(T\mathbf{Z}), \mathbf{R}^{2n}) \mid \bar{\Psi}_{a,K}(w) \leq \bar{\Psi}_{a,K}(u)\}, \tag{2.43}$$

$$\bar{X}_{a,K}(x) = \bar{X}_{a,K}^{\bar{F}_{a,K}(x)} = \{y \in W_s^{1,2}(\mathbf{R}/(T\mathbf{Z}), \mathbf{R}^{2n}) \mid \bar{F}_{a,K}(y) \leq \bar{F}_{a,K}(x)\}. \tag{2.44}$$

Then both sets are S^1-invariant. Denote by $\mathrm{crit}(\bar\Psi_{a,K})$ the set of critical points of $\bar\Psi_{a,K}$. Because $\bar\Psi_{a,K}$ is S^1-invariant, $S^1\cdot u$ becomes a critical orbit if $u\in\mathrm{crit}(\bar\Psi_{a,K})$. Note that by the condition (F'), Lemma 2.3, Proposition 2.4 and Lemma 2.5, the number of critical orbits of $\bar\Psi_{a,K}$ is finite. Hence as usual we can make the following definition.

Definition 2.14. *Suppose u is a nonzero critical point of $\bar\Psi_{a,K}$, and $\mathcal{N}$ is an S^1-invariant open neighborhood of $S^1\cdot u$ such that $\mathrm{crit}(\bar\Psi_{a,K})\cap(\bar\Lambda_{a,K}(u)\cap\mathcal{N}) = S^1\cdot u$. Then the S^1-critical modules of $S^1\cdot u$ are defined by*

$$C_{S^1,q}(\bar\Psi_a, S^1\cdot u) = H_q((\bar\Lambda_{a,K}(u)\cap\mathcal{N})_{S^1}, ((\bar\Lambda_{a,K}(u)\backslash S^1\cdot u)\cap\mathcal{N})_{S^1}),$$

Similarly, we define the S^1-critical modules $C_{S^1,\,q}(\bar F_{a,K},\ S^1\cdot x)$ of $S^1\cdot x$ for $\bar F_{a,K}$.

By the same argument of Proposition 3.2 of [LLW1], we have the following for critical modules.

Proposition 2.15. *For any $\frac{\tau}{T} < a_1 < a_2 < +\infty$, let K be a fixed sufficiently large real number so that (2.19) holds for all $a\in[a_1,a_2]$. Then the critical module $C_{S^1,\,q}(\bar F_{a,K},\ S^1\cdot x)$ is independent of the choice of $\bar H_a$ defined in Proposition 2.4 for any $a\in[a_1,a_2]$ in the sense that if x_i is a solution of (2.17) with Hamiltonian function $\bar H_{a_i}(x)$ with $i=1$ and 2 respectively such that both x_1 and x_2 correspond to the same symmetric closed characteristic (τ,y) on Σ, then we have*

$$C_{S^1,\,q}(\bar F_{a_1,K},\ S^1\cdot x_1) \cong C_{S^1,\,q}(\bar F_{a_2,K},\ S^1\cdot x_2), \qquad \forall\, q\in\mathbf{Z}. \tag{2.45}$$

In other words, the critical modules are independent of the choices of all $a > \frac{\tau}{T}$, the function φ_a satisfying (i)-(ii) of Lemma 2.2, and $\bar H_a$ satisfying Proposition 2.4.

Now we fix an $a > \frac{\hat\tau}{T}$, and write $\bar F_K$ and $\bar H$ for $\bar F_{a,K}$ and $\bar H_a$ respectively. We suppose also that $K\in\mathbf{R}$ satisfies (2.19), i.e.,

$$\bar H_K(x) = \bar H(x) + \frac{1}{2}K|x|^2 \qquad \text{is strictly convex.} \tag{2.46}$$

By Lemma 2.5, the critical points of $\bar F_K$ which are solutions of (2.17) are the same for any K satisfying $\frac{KT}{2\pi}\notin 2\mathbf{Z}-1$. Recall that $e(K) = 2n([K\frac{T}{2\pi}] - [K\frac{T}{4\pi}])$ in Theorem 2.8. The same argument of Theorem 3.3 of [LLW1] proves

Theorem 2.16. *Suppose $\bar x$ is a nonzero critical point of $\bar F_K$. Then the S^1-critical module $C_{S^1,e(K)+l}(\bar F_K, S^1\cdot\bar x)$ is independent of the choice of K for $\frac{KT}{2\pi}\notin 2\mathbf{Z}-1$, i.e.,*

$$C_{S^1,e(K)+l}(\bar F_K, S^1\cdot\bar x) \cong C_{S^1,e(K')+l}(\bar F_{K'}, S^1\cdot\bar x), \tag{2.47}$$

where $\frac{KT}{2\pi}$, $\frac{K'T}{2\pi}\notin 2\mathbf{Z}-1$, $l\in\mathbf{Z}$, and both K and K' satisfy (2.46).

Now we fix a and let $u_K \neq 0$ be a critical point of $\bar{\Psi}_{a,K}$ with multiplicity $\mathrm{mul}(u_K) = m$, that is, u_K corresponds to a symmetric closed characteristic $(\tau, y) \subset \Sigma$ with (τ, y) being m-iteration of some prime symmetric closed characteristic, where m is odd. Precisely, by Proposition 2.4 and Lemma 2.5, we have $u_K = -J\dot{x} + Kx$ with x being a solution of (2.17) and $x = \rho y(\frac{\tau t}{T})$ with $\frac{\varphi_a'(\rho)}{\rho} = \frac{\tau}{aT}$. Moreover, (τ, y) is a symmetric closed characteristic on Σ with minimal period $\frac{\tau}{m}$. Hence the isotropy group satisfies $\{\theta \in S^1 \mid \theta \cdot u_K = u_K\} = \mathbf{Z}_m$ and the orbit of u_K, namely, $S^1 \cdot u_K \cong S^1/\mathbf{Z}_m \cong S^1$. By Lemma 2.11, we obtain a critical point g_K of $\bar{\psi}_{a,K}$ corresponding to u_K, and then its isotropy group satisfies $\{\theta \in S^1 \mid \theta \cdot g_K = g_K\} = \mathbf{Z}_m$. Let $p : N(S^1 \cdot g_K) \to S^1 \cdot g_K$ be the normal bundle of $S^1 \cdot g_K$ in $\bar{G}$ (as defined in Lemma 2.11) and let $p^{-1}(\theta \cdot g_K) = N(\theta \cdot g_K)$ be the fibre over $\theta \cdot g_K$, where $\theta \in S^1$. Let $DN(S^1 \cdot g_K)$ be the ϱ disk bundle of $N(S^1 \cdot g_K)$ for some $\varrho > 0$ sufficiently small, i.e., $DN(S^1 \cdot g_K) = \{\xi \in N(S^1 \cdot g_K) \mid \|\xi\| < \varrho\}$ which is identified by the exponential map with a subset of $\bar{G}$, and let $DN(\theta \cdot g_K) = p^{-1}(\theta \cdot g_K) \cap DN(S^1 \cdot g_K)$ be the disk over $\theta \cdot g_K$. Clearly, $DN(\theta \cdot g_K)$ is $\mathbf{Z}_m$-invariant and we have $DN(S^1 \cdot g_K) = DN(g_K) \times_{\mathbf{Z}_m} S^1$, where the Z_m action is given by

$$(\theta, v, t) \in \mathbf{Z}_m \times DN(g_K) \times S^1 \mapsto (\theta \cdot v,\ \theta^{-1}t) \in DN(g_K) \times S^1.$$

Hence for an S^1 invariant subset Γ of $DN(S^1 \cdot g_K)$, we have $\Gamma/S^1 = (\Gamma_{g_K} \times_{\mathbf{Z}_m} S^1)/S^1 = \Gamma_{g_K}/\mathbf{Z}_m$, where $\Gamma_{g_K} = \Gamma \cap DN(g_K)$.

For a $\mathbf{Z}_m$-space pair (A, B), let

$$H_*(A, B)^{\pm \mathbf{Z}_m} = \{\sigma \in H_*(A, B) \,|\, L_*\sigma = \pm\sigma\},$$

where L is a generator of the $\mathbf{Z}_m$-action, we have

Lemma 2.17. *Suppose $u_K \neq 0$ is a critical point of $\bar{\Psi}_{a,K}$ with $\mathrm{mul}(u_K) = m$, g_K is a critical point of $\bar{\psi}_{a,K}$ corresponding to u_K. Then we have*

$$C_{S^1,*}(\bar{\Psi}_{a,K},\ S^1 \cdot u_K) \cong H_*((\widetilde{\bar{\Lambda}}_{a,K}(g_K) \cap DN(g_K)),\ ((\widetilde{\bar{\Lambda}}_{a,K}(g_K) \setminus \{g_K\}) \cap DN(g_K)))^{\mathbf{Z}_m},$$

where $\widetilde{\bar{\Lambda}}_{a,K}(g_K) = \{g \in \bar{G} \mid \bar{\psi}_{a,K}(g) \leq \bar{\psi}_{a,K}(g_K)\}$.

Proof. We replace Lemma 2.10 used in the proof of Lemma 4.1 of [LLW1] by the above Lemma 2.11, then the proof follows from that of Lemma 4.1 of [LLW1]. ∎

3 Periodic property of critical modules for symmetric closed characteristics

In this section, we use Lemmas 2.11 and 2.17 to obtain the periodic property of critical modules.

By (2.21) and (2.24), we have $C_{S^1,\,q}(\bar\Psi_{a,K},\ S^1\cdot u_K)\cong C_{S^1,\,q}(\bar F_{a,K},\ S^1\cdot x)$. By Proposition 2.15, the module $C_{S^1,\,q}(\bar F_{a,K},\ S^1\cdot x)$ is independent of the choice of the Hamiltonian function $\bar H_a$ whenever $\bar H_a$ satisfies conditions in Proposition 2.4. Hence in order to compute the critical modules, we can choose $\bar\Psi_{a,K}$ with $\bar H_a$ being positively homogeneous of degree $\alpha=\alpha_a$ near the image set of every nonzero solution x of (2.17) corresponding to some symmetric closed characteristic (τ,y) with period τ being strictly less than aT.

In other words, for a given $a>0$, we choose $\vartheta\in(0,1)$ first such that $[aT\vartheta,aT(1-\vartheta)]\supset \mathrm{per}(\Sigma)\cap(0,aT)$ holds by the definition of the set $\mathrm{per}(\Sigma)$ and the assumption (F). Then we choose $\alpha=\alpha_a\in(1,2)$ sufficiently close to 2 by (iii) of Lemma 2.2 such that $\varphi_a(t)=ct^\alpha$ for some constant $c>0$ and $\alpha\in(1,\,2)$ whenever $\frac{\varphi_a'(t)}{t}\in[\vartheta,1-\vartheta]$. Now we suppose that φ_a satisfies (iii) of Lemma 2.2.

Now we consider iterations of critical points of $\bar\Psi_{a,K}$. Suppose $u_K\neq 0$ is a critical point of $\bar\Psi_{a,K}$ with $\mathrm{mul}(u_K)=m$, where m is odd, and g_K is the critical point of $\bar\psi_{a,K}$ corresponding to u_K. By Proposition 2.4 and Lemma 2.5, we have $u_K=-J\dot x+Kx$ with x being a solution of (2.17) and $x=\rho y(\frac{\tau t}{T})$ with $\frac{\varphi_a'(\rho)}{\rho}=\frac{\tau}{aT}$. Moreover, (τ,y) is a symmetric closed characteristic on Σ with minimal period $\frac{\tau}{m}$. For any $p\in 2\mathbf{N}-1$ satisfying $p\tau<aT$, we choose K such that $\frac{pKT}{2\pi}\notin 2\mathbf{Z}-1$, then the pth iteration u_{pK}^p of u_K is given by $-J\dot x^p+pKx^p$, where x^p is the unique solution of (2.17) corresponding to $(p\tau,y)$ and is a critical point of $\bar F_{a,pK}$, that is, u_{pK}^p is the critical point of $\bar\Psi_{a,pK}$ corresponding to x^p. Hence we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&x(t)=\Big(\frac{\tau}{c\alpha a}\Big)^{\frac{1}{\alpha-2}}y(\tau t),\quad x^p(t)=\Big(\frac{p\tau}{c\alpha a}\Big)^{\frac{1}{\alpha-2}}y(p\tau t)=p^{\frac{1}{\alpha-2}}x(pt),\\
&u_K(t)=-J\dot x(t)+Kx(t),\quad u_{pK}^p(t)=-J\dot x^p(t)+pKx^p(t)=p^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha-2}}u_K(pt).
\end{aligned}
$$

We define the pth iteration ϕ^p on $L_s^2(\mathbf{R}/(T\mathbf{Z});\mathbf{R}^{2n})$ by

$$
\phi^p: v_K(t)\mapsto v_{pK}^p(t)\equiv p^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha-2}}v_K(pt). \tag{3.1}
$$

Now we use the notations in Lemma 2.11, we choose $\bar G_{pK}$ in Lemma 2.11 for $\bar\Psi_{a,pK}$ such that $\bar G_{pK}\supseteq\phi^p(\bar G_K)$, where we write $\bar G_K$ for $\bar G$ to indicate its dependence on K. For $g\in DN(S^1\cdot g_K)$, as (4.12) of [LLW1], we have

$$
\bar\psi_{a,pK}(\phi^p(g))=p^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-2}}\bar\psi_{a,K}(g). \tag{3.2}
$$

We define a new inner product $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_p$ on $L_s^2(\mathbf{R}/\mathbf{Z},\mathbf{R}^{2n})$ by

$$
\langle v,w\rangle_p=p^{\frac{2(\alpha-1)}{2-\alpha}}\langle v,w\rangle. \tag{3.3}
$$

Then $\phi^p : DN(g_K) \to DN(g^p_{pK})$ is an isometry from the standard inner product to the above one, where $g^p_{pK} = \phi^p(g_K)$ is the critical point of $\bar\psi_{a,pK}$ corresponding to u^p_{pK} and the radii of the two normal disk bundles are suitably chosen. Clearly $\phi^p(DN(g_K))$ consists of points in $DN(g^p_{pK})$ which are fixed by the $\mathbf{Z}_p$-action. Since the $\mathbf{Z}_p$-action on $DN(g^p_{pK})$ is an isometry and $f \equiv \bar\psi_{a,pK}|_{DN(g^p_{pK})}$ is $\mathbf{Z}_p$-invariant, we have

$$f''(g) = \begin{pmatrix} (f|_{\phi^p(DN(g_K))})'' & 0 \\ 0 & * \end{pmatrix}, \quad \forall g \in \phi^p(DN(g_K)). \tag{3.4}$$

Moreover, we have

$$f'(g) = (f|_{\phi^p(DN(g_K))})', \quad \forall g \in \phi^p(DN(g_K)). \tag{3.5}$$

Now we can apply the results by D. Gromoll and W. Meyer [GrM1] to the manifold $DN(g^p_{pK})$ with g^p_{pK} as its unique critical point. Then $\mathrm{mul}(g^p_{pK}) = pm$ is the multiplicity of g^p_{pK} and the isotropy group $\mathbf{Z}_{pm} \subseteq S^1$ of g^p_{pK} acts on $DN(g^p_{pK})$ by isometries. According to Lemma 1 of [GrM1], we have a $\mathbf{Z}_{pm}$-invariant decomposition of $T_{g^p_{pK}}(DN(g^p_{pK}))$

$$T_{g^p_{pK}}(DN(g^p_{pK})) = \bar V^+ \oplus \bar V^- \oplus \bar V^0 = \{(x_+, x_-, x_0)\} \tag{3.6}$$

with $\dim \bar V^- = \bar i(g^p_{pK}) = \bar i_{pK}(u^p_{pK})$, $\dim \bar V^0 = \bar\nu(g^p_{pK}) - 1 = \bar\nu_{pK}(u^p_{pK}) - 1$ (cf. Lemma 2.11(iii)), and a $\mathbf{Z}_{pm}$-invariant neighborhood $\bar B = \bar B_+ \times \bar B_- \times \bar B_0$ for 0 in $T_{g^p_{pK}}(DN(g^p_{pK}))$ together with two $\mathbf{Z}_{pm}$-invariant diffeomorphisms

$$\bar\Phi : \bar B = \bar B_+ \times \bar B_- \times \bar B_0 \to \bar\Phi(\bar B_+ \times \bar B_- \times \bar B_0) \subset DN(g^p_{pK}),$$

and

$$\bar\eta : \bar B_0 \to W(g^p_{pK}) \equiv \bar\eta(\bar B_0) \subset DN(g^p_{pK}),$$

and $\bar\Phi(0) = \bar\eta(0) = g^p_{pK}$, such that

$$\bar\psi_{a,pK} \circ \bar\Phi(x_+, x_-, x_0) = |x_+|^2 - |x_-|^2 + \bar\psi_{a,pK} \circ \bar\eta(x_0), \tag{3.7}$$

with $d(\bar\psi_{a,pK} \circ \bar\eta)(0) = d^2(\bar\psi_{a,pK} \circ \bar\eta)(0) = 0$. As usual, we call $W(g^p_{pK})$ a local characteristic manifold, and $U(g^p_{pK}) = \bar B_-$ a local negative disk at g^p_{pK}. By the proof of Lemma 1 of [GrM1], $W(g^p_{pK})$ and $U(g^p_{pK})$ are $\mathbf{Z}_{pm}$-invariant. It follows from (3.7) that g^p_{pK} is an isolated critical point of $\bar\psi_{a,pK}|_{DN(g^p_{pK})}$. Then as in Lemma 6.4 of [Rad1], we have

$$\begin{aligned} &H_*(\widetilde{\bar\Lambda}_{a,pK}(g^p_{pK}) \cap DN(g^p_{pK}),\ (\widetilde{\bar\Lambda}_{a,pK}(g^p_{pK}) \setminus \{g^p_{pK}\}) \cap DN(g^p_{pK})) \\ &\quad = \bigoplus_{q \in \mathbf{Z}} H_q(U(g^p_{pK}), U(g^p_{pK}) \setminus \{g^p_{pK}\}) \\ &\qquad\qquad \otimes H_{*-q}(W(g^p_{pK}) \cap \widetilde{\bar\Lambda}_{a,pK}(g^p_{pK}), (W(g^p_{pK}) \setminus \{g^p_{pK}\}) \cap \widetilde{\bar\Lambda}_{a,pK}(g^p_{pK})), \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

where

$$H_q(U(g^p_{pK}), U(g^p_{pK}) \setminus \{g^p_{pK}\}) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{Q}, & \text{if } q = \bar{i}_{pK}(u^p_{pK}), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{3.9}$$

Now we have the following proposition.

Proposition 3.1. *For any $p \in 2\mathbf{N}-1$, we choose K such that $\frac{pKT}{2\pi} \notin 2\mathbf{Z}-1$. Let $u_K \neq 0$ be a critical point of $\bar{\Psi}_{a,K}$ with $\mathrm{mul}(u_K) = 1$, $u_K = -J\dot{x} + Kx$ with x being a critical point of $\bar{F}_{a,K}$. Then for all $q \in \mathbf{Z}$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} &C_{S^1,\,q}(\bar{\Psi}_{a,pK},\ S^1 \cdot u^p_{pK}) \\ &\quad \cong \Big(H_{q-\bar{i}_{pK}(u^p_{pK})}(W(g^p_{pK}) \cap \widetilde{\bar{\Lambda}}_{a,pK}(g^p_{pK}), (W(g^p_{pK}) \setminus \{g^p_{pK}\}) \cap \widetilde{\bar{\Lambda}}_{a,pK}(g^p_{pK}))\Big)^{\mathbf{Z}_p}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

In particular, if u^p_{pK} is non-degenerate, i.e., $\bar{\nu}_{pK}(u^p_{pK}) = 1$, then

$$C_{S^1,\,q}(\bar{\Psi}_{a,pK},\ S^1 \cdot u^p_{pK}) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{Q}, & \text{if } q = \bar{i}_{pK}(u^p_{pK}), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{3.11}$$

Proof. Suppose θ is a generator of the linearized $\mathbf{Z}_p$-action on $U(g^p_{pK})$. Then $\theta(\xi) = \xi$ if and only if $\xi \in T_{g^p_{pK}}(\phi^p(DN(g_K)))$. Hence it follows from (3.2) and (3.4) that $\xi = (\phi^p)_*(\xi')$ for a unique $\xi' \in T_{g_K}(DN(g_K))^-$. Hence the proof of Satz 6.11 in [Rad1], Proposition 2.8 in [BaL1] yield this proposition. Note that $\bar{i}_{pK}(u^p_{pK}) = 2n([pKT/2\pi] - [pKT/4\pi]) + i_{-1}(A_a, p)$ and $\bar{i}_K(u_K) = 2n([KT/2\pi] - [KT/4\pi]) + i_{-1}(A_a, 1)$ follow from Theorem 2.8, and when p is odd, $i_{-1}(A_a, p) - i_{-1}(A_a, 1)$ is always even (cf. Theorem 9.2.1, Theorem 9.3.4 of [Lon3]). ∎

Definition 3.2. *For any $p \in 2\mathbf{N}-1$, we choose K such that $\frac{pKT}{2\pi} \notin 2\mathbf{Z}-1$. Let $u_K \neq 0$ be a critical point of $\bar{\Psi}_{a,K}$ with $\mathrm{mul}(u_K) = 1$, $u_K = -J\dot{x} + Kx$ with x being a critical point of $\bar{F}_{a,K}$. Then for all $l \in \mathbf{Z}$, let*

$$\bar{k}_l(u^p_{pK}) \ = \ \dim \Big(H_l(W(g^p_{pK}) \cap \widetilde{\bar{\Lambda}}_{a,pK}(g^p_{pK}), (W(g^p_{pK}) \setminus \{g^p_{pK}\}) \cap \widetilde{\bar{\Lambda}}_{a,pK}(g^p_{pK}))\Big)^{\mathbf{Z}_p}. \tag{3.12}$$

$\bar{k}_l(u^p_{pK})$'s are called critical type numbers of u^p_{pK}.

Remark 3.3. (i) Since

$$\begin{aligned} C_{S^1,\,l+\bar{i}_{pK}(u^p_{pK})}(\bar{\Psi}_{a,pK},\ S^1 \cdot u^p_{pK}) &\cong C_{S^1,\,l+\bar{i}_{pK}(x^p)}(\bar{F}_{a,pK},\ S^1 \cdot x^p) \\ &\cong C_{S^1,\,l+e(pK)+i_{-1}(A_a,p)}(\bar{F}_{a,pK},\ S^1 \cdot x^p), \end{aligned}$$

by Theorem 2.16, we obtain that $\bar{k}_l(u^p_{pK})$ is independent of the choice of K and denote it by $\bar{k}_l(x^p)$, here $\bar{k}_l(x^p)$'s are called critical type numbers of x^p.

(ii) By Proposition 2.12, we have $\bar{k}_l(u^p_{pK}) = 0$ if $l \notin [0, 2n-2]$.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $u_K \neq 0$ be a critical point of $\bar{\Psi}_{a,K}$ with* $\mathrm{mul}(u_K) = 1$. *Suppose $\bar{\nu}_{mK}(u^m_{mK}) = \bar{\nu}_{pmK}(u^{pm}_{pmK})$ for some $m, p \in 2\mathbf{N} - 1$. Then we have $\bar{k}_l(u^m_{mK}) = \bar{k}_l(u^{pm}_{pmK})$ for all $l \in \mathbf{Z}$.*

Proof. From the above arguments, we obtain our lemma by the same method of the proof of Lemma 4.5 of [LLW1]. ∎

Proposition 3.5. *Let $x \neq 0$ be a critical point of $\bar{F}_{a,K}$ with* $\mathrm{mul}(x) = 1$ *corresponding to a critical point u_K of $\bar{\Psi}_{a,K}$. Then there exists a minimal $\bar{K}(x) \in 2\mathbf{N}$ such that*

$$\nu_{-1}(x^{p+\bar{K}(x)}) = \nu_{-1}(x^p), \quad i_{-1}(x^{p+\bar{K}(x)}) - i_{-1}(x^p) \in 2\mathbf{Z}, \tag{3.13}$$

$$\bar{k}_l(x^{p+\bar{K}(x)}) = \bar{k}_l(x^p), \qquad \forall p \in 2\mathbf{N} - 1,\ l \in \mathbf{Z}, \tag{3.14}$$

where $i_{-1}(x^p)$ is defined in Theorem 2.8. We call $\bar{K}(x)$ the minimal period of critical modules of iterations of the functional $\bar{F}_{a,K}$ at x.

Proof. We replace Lemma 3.3 used in the proof of Proposition 3.4 of [LLo1] by the above Lemma 3.4, then our proposition follows by Proposition 3.4 of [LLo1]. ∎

In the following, we give the definitions of indices and Euler characteristics for symmetric closed characteristics. Let $\bar{F}_{a,K}$ be any function defined by (2.21) with $\bar{H}_a$ satisfying Proposition 2.4, we do not require $\bar{H}_a$ to be homogeneous near its critical points.

Definition 3.6. *Suppose the condition (F') in Section 2 holds. For every symmetric closed characteristic (τ, y) on Σ, let $aT > \tau$ and choose φ_a to satisfy (i)-(ii) of Lemma 2.2. Determine ρ uniquely by $\frac{\varphi_a'(\rho)}{\rho} = \frac{\tau}{aT}$. Let $x = \rho y(\frac{\tau t}{T})$. Then we define the index $\bar{i}(\tau, y)$ and nullity $\bar{\nu}(\tau, y)$ of (τ, y) by (cf. Theorem 2.8)*

$$\bar{i}(\tau, y) = i_{-1}(x), \qquad \bar{\nu}(\tau, y) = \nu_{-1}(x).$$

Then the mean index of (τ, y) is defined by

$$\hat{\bar{i}}(\tau, y) = \lim_{m\to\infty} \frac{\bar{i}((2m-1)\tau, y)}{2m-1}. \tag{3.15}$$

Note that by Proposition 2.12, the index and nullity are well defined and are independent of the choice of $aT > \tau$ and φ_a satisfying (i)-(ii) of Lemma 2.2.

For a prime symmetric closed characteristic (τ, y) on Σ, we denote simply by $y^m \equiv (m\tau, y)$ for $m \in 2\mathbf{N} - 1$. By Proposition 2.15, we can define the critical type numbers $\bar{k}_l(y^m)$ of y^m to be $\bar{k}_l(x^m)$, where x^m is the critical point of $\bar{F}_{a,K}$ corresponding to y^m. We also define $\bar{K}(y) = \bar{K}(x)$, where $\bar{K}(x) \in 2\mathbf{N}$ is given by Proposition 3.5. Suppose $\mathcal{N}$ is an S^1-invariant open neighborhood of $S^1 \cdot x^m$ such that $\mathrm{crit}(\bar{F}_{a,K}) \cap (\bar{X}_{a,K}(x^m) \cap \mathcal{N}) = S^1 \cdot x^m$. Then we make the following definition

Definition 3.7. *The Euler characteristic $\bar\chi(y^m)$ of y^m is defined by*

$$\begin{aligned}\bar\chi(y^m) &\equiv \chi((\bar X_{a,K}(x^m)\cap\mathcal{N})_{S^1},\ ((\bar X_{a,K}(x^m)\setminus S^1\cdot x^m)\cap\mathcal{N})_{S^1})\\ &\equiv \sum_{q=0}^{\infty}(-1)^q\dim C_{S^1,\,q}(\bar F_{a,K},\ S^1\cdot x^m).\end{aligned}\tag{3.16}$$

Here $\chi(A,B)$ denotes the usual Euler characteristic of the space pair (A,B). The average Euler characteristic $\hat{\bar\chi}(y)$ of y is defined by

$$\hat{\bar\chi}(y)=\lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{N}\sum_{1\le m\le N}\bar\chi(y^{2m-1}).\tag{3.17}$$

Note that by Proposition 2.15 and Theorem 2.16, $\bar\chi(y^m)$ is well defined and is independent of the choice of a and K. In fact, by Remark 3.3 (i), we have

$$\bar\chi(y^m)=\sum_{l=0}^{2n-2}(-1)^{\bar i(y^m)+l}\bar k_l(y^m).\tag{3.18}$$

The following remark shows that $\hat{\bar\chi}(y)$ is well-defined and is a rational number.

Remark 3.8. By (3.13), (3.18) and Proposition 3.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\bar\chi}(y) &= \lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{N}\sum_{\substack{1\le m\le N\\ 0\le l\le 2n-2}}(-1)^{\bar i(y^{2m-1})+l}\bar k_l(y^{2m-1})\\ &= \lim_{s\to\infty}\frac{2}{s\bar K(y)}\sum_{\substack{1\le m\le \bar K(y)/2,\ 0\le l\le 2n-2\\ 0\le p<s}}(-1)^{\bar i(y^{p\bar K(y)+2m-1})+l}\bar k_l(y^{p\bar K(y)+2m-1})\\ &= \frac{2}{\bar K(y)}\sum_{\substack{1\le m\le \bar K(y)/2\\ 0\le l\le 2n-2}}(-1)^{\bar i(y^{2m-1})+l}\bar k_l(y^{2m-1}).\end{aligned}\tag{3.19}$$

Therefore $\hat{\bar\chi}(y)$ is well defined and is a rational number. In particular, if all y^ms are non-degenerate, then $\bar\nu(y^m)=1$ for all $m\in 2\mathbf{N}-1$. Hence the proof of Proposition 3.5 yields $\bar K(y)=2$. By (3.11), we have

$$\bar k_l(y^m)=\begin{cases}1, & \text{if } l=0\\ 0, & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

Hence (3.19) implies

$$\hat{\bar\chi}(y)=(-1)^{\bar i(y)}.\tag{3.20}$$

4 Proof of Theorem 1.1

In this section, we give the proof of Theorem 1.1. Firstly, we consider the contribution of the origin to the Morse series of the functional $\bar F_{a,K}$ on $W_s^{1,2}(\mathbf{R}/\mathbf{Z};\mathbf{R}^{2n})$. The same argument as in Theorem 5.1 of [LLW1] and Theorem 7.1 of [Vit2] yields the following:

Theorem 4.1. *Fix an $a > 0$ such that $\mathrm{per}(\Sigma) \cap (0, aT) \neq \emptyset$. Then there exists an $\epsilon_0 > 0$ small enough such that for any $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]$ we have*

$$H_{S^1,\, q+e(K)}(\bar{X}^{\epsilon}_{a,K},\ \bar{X}^{-\epsilon}_{a,K}) = 0, \quad \forall q \in \mathring{I},$$

if I is an interval of $\mathbf{Z}$ such that $I \cap [\bar{i}(\tau, y), \bar{i}(\tau, y) + \bar{\nu}(\tau, y) - 1] = \emptyset$ for all symmetric closed characteristics $(\tau,\, y)$ on Σ with $\tau \geq aT$.

Now we prove Theorem 1.1.

Let $\bar{F}_{a,K}$ be a functional defined by (2.21) for some $a, K \in \mathbf{R}$ sufficiently large and by Proposition 2.6, let $\epsilon > 0$ be small enough such that $[-\epsilon, 0)$ contains no critical values of $\bar{F}_{a,K}$. We consider the exact sequence of the triple $(\bar{X}, \bar{X}^{-\epsilon}, X^{-b})$ (for b large enough)

$$\begin{aligned} \to H_{S^1,*}(\bar{X}^{-\epsilon}, \bar{X}^{-b}) \ &\to \ H_{S^1,*}(\bar{X}, \bar{X}^{-b}) \\ &\to \ H_{S^1,*}(\bar{X}, \bar{X}^{-\epsilon}) \to H_{S^1,*-1}(\bar{X}^{-\epsilon}, \bar{X}^{-b}) \to \cdots, \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

where $\bar{X} = W^{1,2}_s(\mathbf{R}/T\mathbf{Z}; \mathbf{R}^{2n})$. The normalized Morse series of $\bar{F}_{a,K}$ in $\bar{X}^{-\epsilon} \setminus \bar{X}^{-b}$ is defined, as usual, by

$$\bar{M}_a(t) = \sum_{q \geq 0,\ 1 \leq j \leq p} \dim C_{S^1,\, q}(\bar{F}_{a,K},\ S^1 \cdot \bar{v}_j) t^{q - e(K)}, \tag{4.2}$$

where we denote by $\{S^1 \cdot \bar{v}_1, \ldots, S^1 \cdot \bar{v}_p\}$ the critical orbits of $\bar{F}_{a,K}$ with critical values less than $-\epsilon$. We denote by $t^{e(K)} \bar{H}_a(t)$ the Poincaré series of $H_{S^1,*}(\bar{X}^{-\epsilon}, \bar{X}^{-b})$, $\bar{H}_a(t)$ is a Laurent series, and we have the equivariant Morse inequality

$$\bar{M}_a(t) - \bar{H}_a(t) = (1 + t)\bar{R}_a(t), \tag{4.3}$$

where $\bar{R}_a(t)$ is a Laurent series with nonnegative coefficients.

On the other hand, by Corollary 2.10 the Poincaré series of $H_{S^1,*}(\bar{X}, \bar{X}^{-b})$ is $t^{e(K)}(1/(1 - t^2))$. The Poincaré series of $H_{S^1,*}(\bar{X}, \bar{X}^{-\epsilon})$ is $t^{e(K)} \bar{Q}_a(t)$, according to Theorem 4.1, if we set $\bar{Q}_a(t) = \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}} \bar{q}_k t^k$, then

$$\bar{q}_k = 0 \qquad \forall\ k \in \mathring{I}, \tag{4.4}$$

where I is defined in Theorem 4.1. Now using (4.1) and Proposition 1 in Appendix 2 of [Vit2], these results yield

$$\bar{H}_a(t) - \frac{1}{1 - t^2} + \bar{Q}_a(t) = (1 + t)\bar{S}_a(t), \tag{4.5}$$

with $\bar{S}_a(t)$ a Laurent series with nonnegative coefficients. Adding up (4.3) and (4.5) yields

$$\bar{M}_a(t) - \frac{1}{1 - t^2} + \bar{Q}_a(t) = (1 + t)\bar{U}_a(t), \tag{4.6}$$

where $\bar{U}_a(t) = \sum_{i\in\mathbf{Z}} \bar{u}_i t^i$ also has nonnegative coefficients.

Now truncate (4.6) at the degrees $2C$ and $2N$, where we set C equal to $2n^2$, and $2N > 2C$, and write $\bar{M}_a^{2N}(2C;t)$, $\bar{Q}_a^{2N}(2C;t)\cdots$ for the truncated series. Then from (4.6) we infer

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{M}_a^{2N}(2C;t) - \sum_{h=C}^{N} t^{2h} + \bar{Q}_a^{2N}(2C;t)\\ = (1+t)\bar{U}_a^{2N-1}(2C;t) + t^{2N}\bar{u}_{2N} + t^{2C}\bar{u}_{2C-1}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

By (4.4), and the fact that for a large enough $\mathring{I}$ contains $[2C, 2N]$, indeed let $\alpha > 0$ such that any prime symmetric closed characteristic (τ, y) with $\hat{\bar{i}}(y) \neq 0$ has $|\hat{\bar{i}}(y)| > \alpha$, then if $k \geq aT/\min\{\tau_i\}$, we have $|\bar{i}(y^k)| \sim k|\hat{\bar{i}}(y)| \geq k\alpha \geq a\alpha T/\min\{\tau_i\}$, which tends to infinity as $a \to \infty$. So $\bar{Q}_a^{2N}(2C;t) = 0$, and (4.7) can be written

$$\bar{M}_a^{2N}(2C;t) - \sum_{h=C}^{N} t^{2h} = (1+t)\bar{U}_a^{2N-1}(2C;t) + t^{2N}\bar{u}_{2N} + t^{2C}\bar{u}_{2C-1}. \tag{4.8}$$

Changing C into $-C$, N into $-N$, and counting terms with $-2N \leq i \leq -2C$, we obtain

$$\bar{M}_a^{-2C}(-2N;t) = (1+t)\bar{U}_a^{-2C-1}(-2N;t) + t^{-2N}\bar{u}_{-2N-1} + t^{-2C}\bar{u}_{-2C}. \tag{4.9}$$

Denote by $\{x_1, \ldots, x_k\}$ the critical points of $\bar{F}_{a,K}$ corresponding to $\{y_1, \ldots, y_k\}$. Note that $\bar{v}_1, \ldots, \bar{v}_p$ in (4.2) are odd iterations of $x_1, \ldots, x_k$. Since $C_{S^1,\,q}(\bar{F}_{a,K},\ S^1 \cdot x_j^m)$ can be non-zero only for $q = e(K) + \bar{i}(y_j^m) + l$ with $0 \leq l \leq 2n-2$, by Propositions 2.12, 3.1 and Remark 3.3, the normalized Morse series (4.2) becomes

$$\bar{M}_a(t) = \sum_{\substack{1\leq j\leq k,\ 0\leq l\leq 2n-2\\ 1\leq 2m_j-1<aT/\tau_j}} \bar{k}_l(y_j^{2m_j-1}) t^{\bar{i}(y_j^{2m_j-1})+l} = \sum_{\substack{1\leq j\leq k,\ 0\leq l\leq 2n-2\\ 1\leq m_j\leq \bar{K}_j/2,\ s\bar{K}_j+2m_j-1<aT/\tau_j}} \bar{k}_l(y_j^{2m_j-1}) t^{\bar{i}(y_j^{s\bar{K}_j+2m_j-1})+l}, \tag{4.10}$$

where $\bar{K}_j = \bar{K}(y_j)$ and $s \in \mathbf{N}_0$. The last equality follows from Proposition 3.5.

Write $\bar{M}(t) = \sum_{h\in\mathbf{Z}} w_h t^h$, where $\bar{M}(t)$ denotes $\bar{M}_a(t)$ as a tends to infinity. Then we have

$$w_h = \sum_{\substack{1\leq j\leq k,\ 0\leq l\leq 2n-2\\ 1\leq m\leq \bar{K}_j/2}} \bar{k}_l(y_j^{2m-1})\, \#\{s \in \mathbf{N}_0 \,|\, \bar{i}(y_j^{s\bar{K}_j+2m-1}) + l = h\}, \quad \forall\ 2C \leq |h| \leq 2N. \tag{4.11}$$

Note that the right hand side of (4.10) contains only those terms satisfying $s\bar{K}_j + 2m_j - 1 < \frac{aT}{\tau_j}$. Thus (4.11) holds for $2C \leq |h| \leq 2N$ by (4.10).

Claim 1. *$w_h \leq C_1$ for $2C \leq |h| \leq 2N$ with C_1 being independent of a, K.*

In fact, we have

$$\#\{s \in \mathbf{N}_0 \quad | \quad \bar{i}(y_j^{s\bar{K}_j+2m-1}) + l = h\}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \#\{s \in \mathbf{N}_0 \mid \bar{i}(y_j^{s\bar{K}_j+2m-1}) + l = h,\ |\bar{i}(y_j^{s\bar{K}_j+2m-1}) - (s\bar{K}_j + 2m - 1)\hat{\bar{i}}(y_j)| \le 2n\} \\
&\le \#\{s \in \mathbf{N}_0 \mid |h - l - (s\bar{K}_j + 2m - 1)\hat{\bar{i}}(y_j)| \le 2n\} \\
&= \#\left\{s \in \mathbf{N}_0 \;\middle|\; h - l - 2n - (2m-1)\hat{\bar{i}}(y_j) \le s\bar{K}_j\hat{\bar{i}}(y_j) \le h - l + 2n - (2m-1)\hat{\bar{i}}(y_j)\right\} \\
&\le \frac{4n}{\bar{K}_j|\hat{\bar{i}}(y_j)|} + 2, \qquad (4.12)
\end{aligned}
$$

where the first equality follows from the fact that

$$
|\bar{i}(y_j^m) - m\hat{\bar{i}}(y_j)| \le 2n, \quad \forall m \in 2\mathbf{N} - 1,\ 1 \le j \le k, \qquad (4.13)
$$

which follows from Theorem 9.2.1 and Theorems 10.1.2 of [Lon3], Note that $\bar{i}(y_j^{s\bar{K}_j+2m-1}) + l = h \in [2C, 2N]$ holds only when $\hat{\bar{i}}(y_j) > 0$ and $\bar{i}(y_j^{s\bar{K}_j+2m-1}) + l = h \in [-2N, -2C]$ holds only when $\hat{\bar{i}}(y_j) < 0$. Hence Claim 1 holds.

Next we estimate $\bar{M}_a^{2N}(2C; -1)$ and $\bar{M}_a^{-2C}(-2N; -1)$. By (4.11) we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\bar{M}_a^{2N}(2C; -1) = \sum_{h=2C}^{2N} w_h(-1)^h \\
&= \sum_{\substack{1\le j\le k,\ 0\le l\le 2n-2 \\ 1\le m\le \bar{K}_j/2}} (-1)^{\bar{i}(y_j^{2m-1})+l} \bar{k}_l(y_j^{2m-1})\, \#\{s \in \mathbf{N}_0 \,|\, 2C \le \bar{i}(y_j^{s\bar{K}_j+2m-1}) + l \le 2N\}. \qquad (4.14)
\end{aligned}
$$

Here the second equality holds by (3.13). Similarly, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\bar{M}_a^{-2C}(-2N; -1) = \sum_{h=-2N}^{-2C} w_h(-1)^h \\
&= \sum_{\substack{1\le j\le k,\ 0\le l\le 2n-2 \\ 1\le m\le \bar{K}_j/2}} (-1)^{\bar{i}(y_j^{2m-1})+l} \bar{k}_l(y_j^{2m-1})\, \#\{s \in \mathbf{N}_0 \,|\, -2N \le \bar{i}(y_j^{s\bar{K}_j+2m-1}) + l \le -2C\}. \qquad (4.15)
\end{aligned}
$$

Claim 2. *There is a real constant $C_2 > 0$ independent of a, K such that*

$$
\left|\bar{M}_a^{2N}(2C; -1) - \sum_{\substack{1\le j\le k,\ 0\le l\le 2n-2 \\ 1\le m\le \bar{K}_j/2, \hat{\bar{i}}(y_j)>0}} (-1)^{\bar{i}(y_j^{2m-1})+l} \bar{k}_l(y_j^{2m-1}) \frac{2N}{\bar{K}_j\hat{\bar{i}}(y_j)}\right| \le C_2, \qquad (4.16)
$$

$$
\left|\bar{M}_a^{-2C}(-2N; -1) - \sum_{\substack{1\le j\le k,\ 0\le l\le 2n-2 \\ 1\le m\le \bar{K}_j/2, \hat{\bar{i}}(y_j)<0}} (-1)^{\bar{i}(y_j^{2m-1})+l} \bar{k}_l(y_j^{2m-1}) \frac{2N}{\bar{K}_j\hat{\bar{i}}(y_j)}\right| \le C_2, \qquad (4.17)
$$

where the sum in the left hand side of (4.16) equals to $N\sum_{\hat{\bar{i}}(y_j)>0} \frac{\hat{\bar{\chi}}(y_j)}{\hat{\bar{i}}(y_j)}$, the sum in the left hand side of (4.17) equals to $N\sum_{\hat{\bar{i}}(y_j)<0} \frac{\hat{\bar{\chi}}(y_j)}{\hat{\bar{i}}(y_j)}$ by (3.19).

In fact, we have the estimates

$$\begin{aligned}
\#\{s\in\mathbf{N}_0 \;\mid\; & 2C\le \bar{i}(y_j^{s\bar{K}_j+2m-1})+l\le 2N\}\\
&= \#\{s\in\mathbf{N}_0 \mid 2C\le \bar{i}(y_j^{s\bar{K}_j+2m-1})+l\le 2N,\ |\bar{i}(y_j^{s\bar{K}_j+2m-1})-(s\bar{K}_j+2m-1)\hat{\bar{i}}(y_j)|\le 2n\}\\
&\le \#\{s\in\mathbf{N}_0 \mid 0<(s\bar{K}_j+2m-1)\hat{\bar{i}}(y_j)\le 2N-l+2n\}\\
&= \#\left\{s\in\mathbf{N}_0 \;\middle|\; 0\le s\le \frac{2N-l+2n-(2m-1)\hat{\bar{i}}(y_j)}{\bar{K}_j\hat{\bar{i}}(y_j)}\right\}\\
&\le \frac{2N-l+2n}{\bar{K}_j\hat{\bar{i}}(y_j)}+1.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\#\{s\in\mathbf{N}_0 \;\mid\; & 2C\le \bar{i}(y_j^{s\bar{K}_j+2m-1})+l\le 2N\}\\
&= \#\{s\in\mathbf{N}_0 \mid 2C\le \bar{i}(y_j^{s\bar{K}_j+2m-1})+l\le 2N,\ |\bar{i}(y_j^{s\bar{K}_j+2m-1})-(s\bar{K}_j+2m-1)\hat{\bar{i}}(y_j)|\le 2n\}\\
&\ge \#\{s\in\mathbf{N}_0 \mid \bar{i}(y_j^{s\bar{K}_j+2m-1})\le (s\bar{K}_j+2m-1)\hat{\bar{i}}(y_j)+2n\le 2N-l\}\\
&\ge \#\left\{s\in\mathbf{N}_0 \;\middle|\; 0\le s\le \frac{2N-l-2n-(2m-1)\hat{\bar{i}}(y_j)}{\bar{K}_j\hat{\bar{i}}(y_j)}\right\}\\
&\ge \frac{2N-l-2n}{\bar{K}_j\hat{\bar{i}}(y_j)}-2,
\end{aligned}$$

where $m\le \bar{K}_j/2$ is used and we note that $\hat{\bar{i}}(y_j)>0$ when $2C\le \bar{i}(y_j^{s\bar{K}_j+2m-1})+l\le 2N$. Combining these two estimates together with (4.14), we obtain (4.16). Similarly, we obtain (4.17).

Note that all coefficients of $\bar{U}_a(t)$ in (4.8) and (4.9) are nonnegative. Hence, by Claim 1, we have $\bar{u}_h\le w_h\le C_1$ for $h=2N$ or $-2C$ and $\bar{u}_h\le w_{h+1}\le C_1$ for $h=2C-1$ or $-2N-1$. Now we choose a to be sufficiently large, then we can choose N to be sufficiently large.

Note that by Claims 1 and 2, the constants C_1 and C_2 are independent of a and K. Hence dividing both sides of (4.8), (4.9) by N and letting $t=-1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\bar{M}_a^{2N}(2C;-1)-(N-C+1)}{N} &= \frac{\bar{u}_{2N}+\bar{u}_{2C-1}}{N},\\
\frac{\bar{M}_a^{-2C}(-2N;-1)}{N} &= \frac{\bar{u}_{-2N-1}+\bar{u}_{-2C}}{N}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let N tend to infinity, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{N}\bar{M}_a^{2N}(2C;-1)&=1,\\
\lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{N}\bar{M}_a^{-2C}(-2N;-1)&=0.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence (1.3) and (1.4) follow from (4.16) and (4.17). ∎

Let us also mention that if there is no solution with $\hat{\hat{i}} = 0$, we do not need to cut our series at $\pm 2C$; we can cut at $-2N$ and $2N$ only, thus obtaining

$$\bar{M}(t) - \frac{1}{1-t^2} = (1+t)\bar{U}(t), \tag{4.18}$$

where $\bar{M}(t)$ denotes $\bar{M}_a(t)$ as a tends to infinity, $\bar{U}(t)$ denotes $\bar{U}_a(t)$ as a tends to infinity.

5 A brief review on the mean index identities for closed characteristics on compact star-shaped hypersurfaces in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$

In this section, we briefly review the mean index identities for closed characteristics on $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{st}(2n)$ developed in [LLW1] which will be needed in Section 6. All the details of proofs can be found in [LLW1].

We fix a $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{st}(2n)$ and suppose the condition (F) at the beginning of section 2 holds. Note that by the condition (F), the number of critical orbits of $\Psi_{a,K}$ is finite. Hence as usual we can make the following definition.

Definition 5.1. *Suppose u is a nonzero critical point of $\Psi_{a,K}$, and $\mathcal{N}$ is an S^1-invariant open neighborhood of $S^1 \cdot u$ such that* $\mathrm{crit}(\Psi_{a,K}) \cap (\Lambda_{a,K}(u) \cap \mathcal{N}) = S^1 \cdot u$. *Then the S^1-critical modules of $S^1 \cdot u$ are defined by*

$$C_{S^1,\,q}(\Psi_{a,K},\ S^1 \cdot u) = H_q((\Lambda_{a,K}(u) \cap \mathcal{N})_{S^1},\ ((\Lambda_{a,K}(u) \setminus S^1 \cdot u) \cap \mathcal{N})_{S^1}).$$

Similarly, we define the S^1-critical modules $C_{S^1,\,q}(F_{a,K},\ S^1 \cdot x)$ of $S^1 \cdot x$ for $F_{a,K}$.

We fix a and let $u_K \neq 0$ be a critical point of $\Psi_{a,K}$ with multiplicity $\mathrm{mul}(u_K) = m$, that is, u_K corresponds to a closed characteristic $(\sigma, z) \subset \Sigma$ with (σ, z) being m-iteration of some prime closed characteristic. Precisely, we have $u_K = -J\dot{x} + Kx$ with x being a solution of (2.1) and $x = \rho z(\frac{\sigma t}{T})$ with $\frac{\varphi_a'(\rho)}{\rho} = \frac{\sigma}{aT}$. Moreover, (σ, z) is a closed characteristic on Σ with minimal period $\frac{\sigma}{m}$. By Lemma 2.10 of [LLW1], we construct a finite dimensional S^1-invariant subspace G of $L^2(\mathbf{R}/T\mathbf{Z}; \mathbf{R}^{2n})$ and a functional $\psi_{a,K}$ on G. For any $p \in \mathbf{N}$ satisfying $p\sigma < aT$, we choose K such that $pK \notin \frac{2\pi}{T}\mathbf{Z}$, then the pth iteration u_{pK}^p of u_K is given by $-J\dot{x}^p + pKx^p$, where x^p is the unique solution of (2.1) corresponding to $(p\sigma, z)$ and is a critical point of $F_{a,pK}$, that is, u_{pK}^p is the critical point of $\Psi_{a,pK}$ corresponding to x^p. Denote by g_{pK}^p the critical point of $\psi_{a,pK}$ corresponding to u_{pK}^p and let $\widetilde{\Lambda}_{a,K}(g_K) = \{g \in G \mid \psi_{a,K}(g) \leq \psi_{a,K}(g_K)\}$.

Now we use the theory of Gromoll and Meyer, denote by $W(g_{pK}^p)$ the local characteristic manifold of g_{pK}^p. Then we have

Proposition 5.2.(cf. Proposition 4.2 of [LLW1]) *For any $p \in \mathbf{N}$, we choose K such that $pK \notin \frac{2\pi}{T}\mathbf{Z}$. Let $u_K \neq 0$ be a critical point of $\Psi_{a,K}$ with $\mathrm{mul}(u_K) = 1$, $u_K = -J\dot{x} + Kx$ with x being a critical point of $F_{a,K}$. Then for all $q \in \mathbf{Z}$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} &C_{S^1,\,q}(\Psi_{a,pK},\ S^1 \cdot u^p_{pK}) \\ &\quad \cong \Big(H_{q-i_{pK}(u^p_{pK})}(W(g^p_{pK}) \cap \widetilde{\Lambda}_{a,pK}(g^p_{pK}), (W(g^p_{pK}) \setminus \{g^p_{pK}\}) \cap \widetilde{\Lambda}_{a,pK}(g^p_{pK}))\Big)^{\beta(x^p)\mathbf{Z}_p}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

where $\beta(x^p) = (-1)^{i_{pK}(u^p_{pK}) - i_K(u_K)} = (-1)^{i^v(x^p) - i^v(x)}$. Thus

$$C_{S^1,\,q}(\Psi_{a,pK},\ S^1 \cdot u^p_{pK}) = 0 \quad if q < i_{pK}(u^p_{pK}) \text{ or } q > i_{pK}(u^p_{pK}) + \nu_{pK}(u^p_{pK}) - 1. \tag{5.2}$$

In particular, if u^p_{pK} is non-degenerate, i.e., $\nu_{pK}(u^p_{pK}) = 1$, then

$$C_{S^1,\,q}(\Psi_{a,pK},\ S^1 \cdot u^p_{pK}) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{Q}, & \text{if } q = i_{pK}(u^p_{pK}) \text{ and } \beta(x^p) = 1, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{5.3}$$

We make the following definition:

Definition 5.3. *For any $p \in \mathbf{N}$, we choose K such that $pK \notin \frac{2\pi}{T}\mathbf{Z}$. Let $u_K \neq 0$ be a critical point of $\Psi_{a,K}$ with $\mathrm{mul}(u_K) = 1$, $u_K = -J\dot{x} + Kx$ with x being a critical point of $F_{a,K}$. Then for all $l \in \mathbf{Z}$, let*

$$\begin{aligned} k_{l,\pm 1}(u^p_{pK}) &= \dim \Big(H_l(W(g^p_{pK}) \cap \widetilde{\Lambda}_{a,pK}(g^p_{pK}), (W(g^p_{pK}) \setminus \{g^p_{pK}\}) \cap \widetilde{\Lambda}_{a,pK}(g^p_{pK}))\Big)^{\pm\mathbf{Z}_p}, \\ k_l(u^p_{pK}) &= \dim \Big(H_l(W(g^p_{pK}) \cap \widetilde{\Lambda}_{a,pK}(g^p_{pK}), (W(g^p_{pK}) \setminus \{g^p_{pK}\}) \cap \widetilde{\Lambda}_{a,pK}(g^p_{pK}))\Big)^{\beta(x^p)\mathbf{Z}_p}. \end{aligned}$$

Here $k_l(u^p_{pK})$'s are called critical type numbers of u^p_{pK}.

By Theorem 3.3 of [LLW1], we obtain that $k_l(u^p_{pK})$ is independent of the choice of K and denote it by $k_l(x^p)$, here $k_l(x^p)$'s are called critical type numbers of x^p.

We have the following properties for critical type numbers:

Proposition 5.4.(cf. Proposition 4.6 of [LLW1]) *Let $x \neq 0$ be a critical point of $F_{a,K}$ with $\mathrm{mul}(x) = 1$ corresponding to a critical point u_K of $\Psi_{a,K}$. Then there exists a minimal $K(x) \in \mathbf{N}$ such that*

$$\nu^v(x^{p+K(x)}) = \nu^v(x^p), \quad i^v(x^{p+K(x)}) - i^v(x^p) \in 2\mathbf{Z}, \qquad \forall p \in \mathbf{N}, \tag{5.4}$$

$$k_l(x^{p+K(x)}) = k_l(x^p), \qquad \forall p \in \mathbf{N},\ l \in \mathbf{Z}. \tag{5.5}$$

We call $K(x)$ the minimal period of critical modules of iterations of the functional $F_{a,K}$ at x.

For every closed characteristic (σ, z) on Σ, let $aT > \sigma$ and choose φ_a as above. Determine ρ uniquely by $\frac{\varphi_a'(\rho)}{\rho} = \frac{\sigma}{aT}$. Let $x = \rho z(\frac{\sigma t}{T})$. Then we define the index $i(\sigma, z)$ and nullity $\nu(\sigma, z)$ of (σ, z) by

$$i(\sigma, z) = i^v(x), \qquad \nu(\sigma, z) = \nu^v(x).$$

Then the mean index of (σ, z) is defined by

$$\hat{i}(\sigma, z) = \lim_{m\to\infty} \frac{i(m\sigma, z)}{m}. \tag{5.6}$$

Note that by Proposition 2.11 of [LLW1], the index and nullity are well defined and are independent of the choice of a.

For a closed characteristic (σ, z) on Σ, we simply denote by $z^m \equiv (m\sigma, z)$ the m-th iteration of z for $m \in \mathbf{N}$. By Proposition 3.2 of [LLW1], we can define the critical type numbers $k_l(z^m)$ of z^m to be $k_l(x^m)$, where x^m is the critical point of $F_{a,K}$ corresponding to z^m. We also define $K(z) = K(x)$.

Lemma 5.5. *For a symmetric closed characteristic (σ, z), we have $\hat{\bar{i}}(z) = \frac{\hat{i}(z)}{2}$, where $\hat{\bar{i}}(z)$ is defined in Definition 3.6.*

Proof. Denote by $\gamma \equiv \gamma_z$ the associated symplectic paths of (σ, z), let $\psi = \gamma|_{[0,\sigma/2]}$, then we have $\gamma|_{[0,\sigma]} = \psi^2$. Now using Theorem 9.2.1 of [Lon3] and Definition 3.6, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\bar{i}}(z) &= \lim_{m\to\infty} \frac{\bar{i}(z^{2m-1})}{2m-1} \\
&= \lim_{m\to\infty} \frac{i_{-1}(z^{2m-1})}{2m-1} \\
&= \lim_{m\to\infty} \frac{i_1(\psi^{4m-2}) - i_1(\psi^{2m-1})}{2m-1} \\
&= \hat{i}(\psi) = \frac{\hat{i}(z)}{2},
\end{aligned}$$

our lemma follows. ∎

Remark 5.6.(cf. Remark 4.10 of [LLW1]) *Note that $k_l(z^m) = 0$ for $l \notin [0, \nu(z^m) - 1]$ and it can take only values 0 or 1 when $l = 0$ or $l = \nu(z^m) - 1$. Moreover, the following facts are useful:*

(i) $k_0(z^m) = 1$ implies $k_l(z^m) = 0$ for $1 \le l \le \nu(z^m) - 1$.

(ii) $k_{\nu(z^m)-1}(z^m) = 1$ implies $k_l(z^m) = 0$ for $0 \le l \le \nu(z^m) - 2$.

(iii) $k_l(z^m) \ge 1$ for some $1 \le l \le \nu(z^m) - 2$ implies $k_0(z^m) = k_{\nu(z^m)-1}(z^m) = 0$.

(iv) In particular, only one of the $k_l(z^m)$s for $0 \le l \le \nu(z^m)-1$ can be non-zero when $\nu(z^m) \le 3$.

For a closed characteristic (σ, z) on Σ, the average Euler characteristic $\hat{\chi}(z)$ of z is defined by

$$\hat{\chi}(z) = \frac{1}{K(z)} \sum_{\substack{1\le m\le K(z)\\ 0\le l\le 2n-2}} (-1)^{i(z^m)+l} k_l(z^m). \tag{5.7}$$

$\hat{\chi}(z)$ is a rational number. In particular, if all z^ms are non-degenerate, then by Proposition 5.4 we have

$$\hat{\chi}(z) = \begin{cases} (-1)^{i(z)}, & \text{if } \ i(z^2) - i(z) \in 2\mathbf{Z}, \\ \frac{(-1)^{i(z)}}{2}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{5.8}$$

We have the following mean index identities for closed characteristics.

Theorem 5.7. *Suppose that $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{st}(2n)$ satisfies ${}^{\#}\mathcal{T}(\Sigma) < +\infty$. Denote all the geometrically distinct prime closed characteristics by $\{(\sigma_j,\ z_j)\}_{1\le j\le k'}$. Then the following identities hold*

$$\sum_{\substack{1\le j\le k' \\ \hat{i}(z_j)>0}} \frac{\hat{\chi}(z_j)}{\hat{i}(z_j)} \ = \ \frac{1}{2}, \tag{5.9}$$

$$\sum_{\substack{1\le j\le k' \\ \hat{i}(z_j)<0}} \frac{\hat{\chi}(z_j)}{\hat{i}(z_j)} \ = \ 0. \tag{5.10}$$

Let $F_{a,K}$ be a functional defined by (2.4) for some $a, K \in \mathbf{R}$ sufficiently large and let $\epsilon > 0$ be small enough such that $[-\epsilon, 0)$ contains no critical values of $F_{a,K}$. For b large enough, The normalized Morse series of $F_{a,K}$ in $X^{-\epsilon} \setminus X^{-b}$ is defined, as usual, by

$$M_a(t) = \sum_{q\ge 0,\ 1\le j\le p} \dim C_{S^1,\,q}(F_{a,K},\ S^1\cdot v_j)t^{q-d(K)}, \tag{5.11}$$

where we denote by $\{S^1\cdot v_1, \dots, S^1\cdot v_p\}$ the critical orbits of $F_{a,K}$ with critical values less than $-\epsilon$. The Poincaré series of $H_{S^1,*}(X, X^{-\epsilon})$ is $t^{d(K)}Q_a(t)$, according to Theorem 5.1 of [LLW1], if we set $Q_a(t) = \sum_{k\in\mathbf{Z}} q_k t^k$, then

$$q_k = 0 \qquad\qquad \forall\ k \in \mathring{I}, \tag{5.12}$$

where I is an interval of $\mathbf{Z}$ such that $I \cap [i(\sigma,z), i(\sigma,z)+\nu(\sigma,z)-1] = \emptyset$ for all closed characteristics (σ, z) on Σ with $\sigma \ge aT$. Then by Section 6 of [LLW1], we have

$$M_a(t) - \frac{1}{1-t^2} + Q_a(t) = (1+t)U_a(t), \tag{5.13}$$

where $U_a(t) = \sum_{i\in\mathbf{Z}} u_i t^i$ is a Laurent series with nonnegative coefficients. If there is no closed characteristic with $\hat{i} = 0$, then

$$M(t) - \frac{1}{1-t^2} = (1+t)U(t), \tag{5.14}$$

where $M(t) = \sum_{i\in\mathbf{Z}} m_i t^i$ denotes the limit of $M_a(t)$ as a tends to infinity, $U(t) = \sum_{i\in\mathbf{Z}} u_i t^i$ denotes the limit of $U_a(t)$ as a tends to infinity and possesses only non-negative coefficients. Specially for our later applications in Section 6, suppose that there exists an integer $p < 0$ such that the coefficients of $M(t)$ satisfy $m_p > 0$ and $m_q = 0$ for all integers $q < p$. Then (5.14) implies

$$m_{p+1} \ge m_p. \tag{5.15}$$

6 Proof of Theorem 1.4

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.4 by using the mean index identities in Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 5.7, Morse inequality and the index iteration theory developed by Y. Long and his coworkers.

The following theorem relates the Morse index defined in Section 5 to the Maslov-type index.

Theorem 6.1. (cf. Theorem 2.1 of [HuL1]) *Suppose $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{st}(2n)$ and $(\tau, y) \in \mathcal{T}(\Sigma)$. Then we have*

$$i(y^m) \equiv i(m\tau, y) = i(y, m) - n, \quad \nu(y^m) \equiv \nu(m\tau, y) = \nu(y, m), \qquad \forall m \in \mathbf{N}, \tag{6.1}$$

where $i(y, m)$ and $\nu(y, m)$ are the Maslov-type index and nullity of $(m\tau, y)$ (cf. Section 5.4 of [Lon3]). In particular, we have $\hat{i}(\tau, y) = \hat{i}(y, 1)$, where $\hat{i}(\tau, y)$ is given in Section 5, $\hat{i}(y, 1)$ is the mean Maslov-type index (cf. Definition 8.1 of [Lon3]). Hence we denote it simply by $\hat{i}(y)$.

In the following, we fix $n = 2$. Before we give the proof of Theorem 1.4, we need a proposition:

Proposition 6.2. *Let $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{st}(4)$ satisfy $^{\#}\mathcal{T}(\Sigma) = 2$. Denote the two geometrically distinct prime closed characteristics by $\{(\tau_j,\ y_j)\}_{1\le j\le 2}$. If $i(y_j) \ge 0, j = 1, 2$, then both of the closed characteristics are elliptic.*

Proof. Denote by $\gamma_j \equiv \gamma_{y_j}$ the associated symplectic paths of $(\tau_j,\ y_j)$ for $1 \le j \le 2$. Then by Lemma 3.3 of [HuL1] (cf. also Lemma 15.2.4 of [Lon3]), there exist $P_j \in \mathrm{Sp}(4)$ and $M_j \in \mathrm{Sp}(2)$ such that

$$\gamma_j(\tau_j) = P_j^{-1}(N_1(1,\ 1) \diamond M_j)P_j,\ \ j = 1, 2, \tag{6.2}$$

where $N_1(\lambda,\ b) = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & b \\ 0 & \lambda \end{pmatrix}$ for $\lambda, b \in \mathbf{R}$. By assumption that $i(y_j) \ge 0$ and Theorem 6.1, we have $i(y_j, 1) \ge 2$, together with (6.2), by Corollary 8.3.2 of [Lon3], it gives $\hat{i}(y_j) > 2$. Then (5.14) holds. Thus for every $k \in \mathbf{N}$, when a is large enough, there exist some $1 \le j \le 2$ and $m \in \mathbf{N}$ such that

$$C_{S^1,\, d(K)+2(k-1)}(F_{a,K},\ S^1 \cdot x_j^m) \ne 0, \tag{6.3}$$

where x_j is the critical point of $F_{a,K}$ corresponding to y_j. Using the common index jump theorem (Theorems 4.3 and 4.4 of [LoZ1], Theorems 11.2.1 and 11.2.2 of [Lon3]), we obtain infinitely many $(N, m_1, m_2) \in \mathbf{N}^3$ such that

$$i(y_j, 2m_j + 1) = 2N + i(y_j, 1), \tag{6.4}$$

$$i(y_j, 2m_j - 1) + \nu(y_j, 2m_j - 1) = 2N - (i(y_j, 1) + 2S^+_{\gamma_j(\tau_j)}(1) - \nu(y_j, 1)). \tag{6.5}$$

Since $i(y_j, 1) \ge 2$, then (22) on Page 340 of [Lon3] also holds for $n = 2$ and (6.4), (6.5) yield

$$i(y_j, 2m_j + 1) \ge 2N + 2, \tag{6.6}$$

$$i(y_j, 2m_j - 1) + \nu(y_j, 2m_j - 1) - 1 \le 2N - 3. \tag{6.7}$$

Combining $i(y_j,1)\geq 2$ with Theorem 10.2.4 of [Lon3], we have

$$i(y_j,m)<i(y_j,m+1),\qquad \forall\, m\in\mathbf{N},\ j=1,2. \tag{6.8}$$

Thus by (6.3), (6.6)-(6.8) and Theorem 6.1, noticing Remark 5.6 (iv), for $s=1,2$ we have $C_{S^1,\,2N-2s}(F_{a,K},\ S^1\cdot x_{j_s}^{2m_{j_s}})\neq 0$, where $\{j_s\mid s=1,2\}=\{1,2\}$. Then by the proof of Theorem 15.5.2 of [Lon3], we obtain that the two closed characteristics are elliptic. ∎

Remark 6.3. *If $\Sigma\in\mathcal{H}_{con}(4)$ satisfy $^{\#}\mathcal{T}(\Sigma)=2$, then $i(y_j)\geq 0, j=1,2$ holds. Thus both of the closed characteristics are elliptic by the above proposition. But for star-shaped case, such a good lower bound for initial indices may not hold generally. Thus in the following proof of Theorem 1.4, we continue in four cases and try to get such a lower bound for all cases.*

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Let $\Sigma\in\mathcal{SH}_{st}(4)$ and denote by $\{(\tau_1,\ y_1),\ (\tau_2,\ y_2)\}$ the two geometrically distinct prime closed characteristics on Σ, and by $\gamma_j\equiv\gamma_{y_j}$ the associated symplectic paths of $(\tau_j,\ y_j)$ for $1\leq j\leq 2$. Then as in the proof of Proposition 6.2, there exist $P_j\in\mathrm{Sp}(4)$ and $M_j\in\mathrm{Sp}(2)$ such that

$$\gamma_j(\tau_j)=P_j^{-1}(N_1(1,\,1)\diamond M_j)P_j,\quad \text{for } j=1,2. \tag{6.9}$$

Since $\Sigma\in\mathcal{SH}_{st}(4)$, by Theorem 1 of [Gir1] and Lemma 4.2 of [LLZ1], both $(\tau_1,\ y_1)$ and $(\tau_2,\ y_2)$ must be symmetric. Let $\psi_j=\gamma_j|_{[0,\tau_j/2]}$, then we have

$$\gamma_j|_{[0,\tau_j]}=\psi_j^2\quad\text{and}\quad \gamma_j(\tau_j)=\gamma_j(\tau_j/2)^2. \tag{6.10}$$

Note that by Section 9 of [Vit2], we know that there exists at least one non-hyperbolic closed characteristic on Σ and it is certainly elliptic when $n=2$. In the following, we prove Theorem 1.4 by contradiction. Without loss of generality, we suppose that (τ_1,y_1) is elliptic and (τ_2,y_2) is hyperbolic.

For the properties of these two orbits, we have

Claim 1. *The closed characteristics (τ_1,y_1) and (τ_2,y_2) satisfy*

(i) $i(y_2^m)=m(i(y_2)+3)-3$ and $\nu(y_2^m)=1$ for all $m\in\mathbf{N}$, and thus $\hat{i}(y_2)=i(y_2)+3$.

(ii) $\hat{i}(y_2)>0$;

(iii) $i(\psi_2^m)=mi(\psi_2)-\frac{1+(-1)^m}{2}$ for all $m\in\mathbf{N}$;

(iv) $i(y_2)=i(y_2,1)-2=i(\psi_2^2)-2=2i(\psi_2)-3\ \in\ 2\mathbf{N}-3$;

(v) $\hat{\chi}(y_2)=(-1)^{i(y_2)}=-1$ and

$$\frac{\hat{\chi}(y_2)}{\hat{i}(y_2)}=\frac{-1}{\hat{i}(y_2)}<0.$$

(vi) If $i(y_2) = -1$, then $\{y_2^m \,|\, m \in \mathbf{N}\}$ contributes to every Morse type number m_q in (5.14) precisely a 1 for each odd $q \in \mathbf{Z}$ with $q \geq i(y_2)$ and nothing for all the other $q \in \mathbf{Z}$.

(vii) $0 < \hat{i}(y_1) \in \mathbf{Q}$.

(viii) $\hat{\chi}(y_1) > 0$ *and*

$$\frac{\hat{\chi}(y_1)}{\hat{i}(y_1)} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\hat{\chi}(y_2)}{\hat{i}(y_2)} > \frac{1}{2}.$$

In fact, by Theorem 8.3.1 of [Lon3] (Theorem 1.3 of [Lon2]), we have $i(y_2, m) = m(i(y_2, 1)+1)-1$ for all $m \in \mathbf{N}$. Together with Theorem 6.1, we obtain (i).

We claim $\hat{i}(y_2) \neq 0$. In fact, because y_2 is hyperbolic, y_2^m is non-degenerate for every $m \geq 1$. Thus if $\hat{i}(y_2) = 0$, we then have $i(y_2^m) = i(y_2, m) - 2 = -3$ for all $m \geq 1$. Then the Morse type number satisfies $M_{-3} = +\infty$. But then $\hat{i}(y_1)$ must be positive by Theorem 5.7, and contributions of $\{y_1^m\}$ to every Morse type number thus must be finite. Then the Morse inequality yields a contradiction and proves the claim (cf. the proof below (9.3) of [Vit2] for details).

If $\hat{i}(y_2) < 0$, by (5.10) we obtain

$$\frac{\hat{\chi}(y_2)}{\hat{i}(y_2)} = 0. \tag{6.11}$$

But because (τ_2, y_2) is hyperbolic, by (5.8) we have $\hat{\chi}(y_2) \neq 0$, which contradicts to (6.11) and proves (ii).

Because (τ_2, y_2) is hyperbolic, the 2×2 matrix M_2 is hyperbolic. Thus by the proof of Proposition 2.12, we have

$$\gamma_2(\tau_2/2) = N_1(-1, -1)\diamond C, \tag{6.12}$$

in an appropriate coordinates and the fact $C^2 = M_2$ implies $\sigma(C) \cap \mathbf{U} = \emptyset$, where C is a symplectic matrix and $\sigma(C)$ denotes the spectrum of the matrix C, $\mathbf{U}$ is the unit circle in the complex plane. Then by Theorem 8.3.1 of [Lon3], we obtain (iii) and then $i(y_2)$ is odd. Then together with (i) and (ii), it yields $i(y_2) \geq -1$, i.e., (iv) holds.

Since $i(y_2^2) - i(y_2) = i(y_2) + 3 \in 2\mathbf{Z}$ holds and y_2 is hyperbolic by the above (i) and (iv), by (5.8) and the above (iv) we obtain the first equality in (v). Together with above (ii), it yields the second equality and estimate in (v).

Note that if $i(y_2) = -1$, by (i), the set $\Theta(y_2) = \{i(y_2^m) \,|\, m \in \mathbf{N}\}$ consists of every odd integer not less than $i(y_2)$ precisely once. Note also that y_2^m is non-degenerate for every $m \in \mathbf{N}$ by (i). Then (vi) follows from (5.3) of Proposition 5.2.

If (τ_1, y_1) and its iterates are all non-degenerate, since (τ_1, y_1) is elliptic, then $\hat{i}(y_1)$ must be irrational by Corollary 8.3.2 of [Lon3] and then so is $\frac{\hat{\chi}(y_1)}{\hat{i}(y_1)}$, because $\hat{\chi}(y_1)$ is rational. Then by (5.9)

of Theorem 5.7, the other closed characteristic (τ_2, y_2) must possess an irrational mean index $\hat{i}(y_2)$, which contradicts to the second identity in (i), and thus $\hat{i}(y_1)$ must be rational. On the other hand, because of the above (ii) and (v) as well as (5.9) of Theorem 5.7, we obtain $\hat{i}(y_1) > 0$ and proves (vii).

Now by the above (ii), (v), (vii), and (5.9) of Theorem 5.7 we obtain (viii).

The proof of Claim 1 is complete.

By (vii) of Claim 1, we only need to consider the following four cases according to the classification of basic norm forms of $\gamma_1(\tau_1)$. In the following we use the notations from Definition 1.8.5 and Theorem 1.8.10 of [Lon3], and specially we let $R(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta & -\sin\theta \\ \sin\theta & \cos\theta \end{pmatrix}$ with $\theta \in \mathbf{R}$, and use $M \diamond N$ to denote the symplectic direct sum of two symplectic matrices M and N as in pages 16-17 of [Lon3].

Case 1. *$\gamma_1(\tau_1)$ can be connected to $N_1(1,1)\diamond N_1(-1,b)$ within $\Omega^0(\gamma_1(\tau_1))$ with $b = 0$ or ± 1.*

In this case, by Theorems 8.1.4 and 8.1.5 of [Lon3], and Theorem 6.1, we have

$$i(y_1, 1) \quad \text{and} \quad i(y_1) \quad \text{are even.} \tag{6.13}$$

By Theorem 1.3 of [Lon2], we have

$$\begin{aligned} i(y_1, m) &= m(i(y_1, 1) + 1) - 1, \quad \text{for } b = 1; \\ i(y_1, m) &= m(i(y_1, 1) + 1) - 1 - \frac{1 + (-1)^m}{2}, \quad \text{for } b = 0, -1. \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 6.1, we obtain

$$i(y_1^m) = m(i(y_1) + 3) - 3, \quad \text{for } b = 1; \tag{6.14}$$

$$i(y_1^m) = m(i(y_1) + 3) - 3 - \frac{1 + (-1)^m}{2}, \quad \text{for } b = 0, -1. \tag{6.15}$$

Then in both cases we obtain

$$\hat{i}(y_1) = i(y_1) + 3. \tag{6.16}$$

Note that by Proposition 5.4 and the form of $\gamma_1(\tau_1)$, we have $K(y_1) = 2$. Thus by (viii) of Claim 1 and (5.7), we obtain

$$0 < \hat{\chi}(y_1) = \frac{1 + (-1)^{i(y_1^2)}(k_0(y_1^2) - k_1(y_1^2) + k_2(y_1^2))}{2}. \tag{6.17}$$

Because at most one of $k_l(y_1^2)'s$ for $0 \le l \le 2$ can be non-zero by Remark 5.6 (iv), we obtain

$$(-1)^{i(y_1^2)+l} k_l(y_1^2) \ge 0, \qquad \text{for } l = 0, 1, 2. \tag{6.18}$$

when m is odd, we have $\nu(x_1^m) = 1$ by the assumption on $\gamma_1(\tau_1)$. In this case, because $i(y_1)$ is even by (6.13), we have $i^v(x_1^m) = i(y_1^m) = m(i(y_1)+3) - 3$ is even, and then

$$\beta(x^m) = (-1)^{i^v(x_1^m) - i^v(x_1)} = 1,$$

where we denote by x_j the critical point of $F_{a,K}$ corresponding to y_j for $j = 1$ and 2. Thus by (5.3) of Proposition 5.2 for every odd $m \in \mathbf{N}$, we obtain

$$C_{S^1,\, d(K)+k}(F_{a,K},\ S^1 \cdot x_1^m) = \mathbf{Q}, \qquad \text{if } \ k = i(y_1^m), \tag{6.19}$$

$$C_{S^1,\, d(K)+k}(F_{a,K},\ S^1 \cdot x_1^m) = 0, \qquad \text{if } k \neq i(y_1^m), \tag{6.20}$$

where (6.20) holds specially when $k \in 2\mathbf{Z} - 1$.

When m is even, we continue in two cases (A) for $b = 1$ with (6.14) and (B) for $b = 0, -1$ with (6.15).

(A) *m is even, $b = 0$ or -1, and (6.15) holds.*

In this case, $i(y_1^2)$ is even by (6.15). Therefore by (6.17) we obtain

$$k_1(y^2) = 0, \quad \hat{\chi}(y_1) = \frac{1 + (k_0(y_1^2) + k_2(y_1^2))}{2} > 0. \tag{6.21}$$

Because $K(y_1) = 2$, we then obtain

$$C_{S^1,\, d(K)+2k-1}(F_{a,K},\ S^1 \cdot x_1^m) = 0, \qquad \forall k \in \mathbf{Z}, m \in 2\mathbf{N}. \tag{6.22}$$

Therefore when $b = 0, -1$ from (6.19), (6.20) and (6.22) we obtain

$$C_{S^1,\, d(K)+2k-1}(F_{a,K},\ S^1 \cdot x_1^m) = 0, \qquad \forall k \in \mathbf{Z}, m \in \mathbf{N}. \tag{6.23}$$

(B) *m is even, $b = 1$, and (6.14) holds.*

In this case, $i(y_1^2)$ is odd by (6.14). Therefore by (6.17) we obtain

$$k_0(y^2) = k_2(y^2) = 0, \quad 0 < \hat{\chi}(y_1) = \frac{1 + k_1(y_1^2)}{2}. \tag{6.24}$$

Because $K(y_1) = 2$, we then obtain

$$C_{S^1,\, d(K)+2k-1}(F_{a,K},\ S^1 \cdot x_1^m) = 0, \qquad \forall k \in \mathbf{Z}, m \in 2\mathbf{N}. \tag{6.25}$$

By (vii) and (viii) of Claim 1, we have

$$\frac{1 + k_1(y_1^2)}{2(i(y_1)+3)} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{|\hat{\chi}(y_2)|}{i(y_2)+3} > \frac{1}{2}.$$

Specially this implies $k_1(y_1^2) > 0$, and then when m is even, we obtain

$$C_{S^1,\, d(K)+k}(F_{a,K},\ S^1 \cdot x_1^m) = \mathbf{Q}, \quad \text{if and only if} \quad k = i(y_1^m) + 1. \tag{6.26}$$

Therefore when $b = 1$, from (6.19), (6.20), (6.25) and (6.26), we obtain

$$C_{S^1,\, d(K)+2k-1}(F_{a,K},\ S^1 \cdot x_1^m) = 0, \qquad \forall k \in \mathbf{Z}, m \in \mathbf{N}. \tag{6.27}$$

Specially from (6.23) and (6.27), for any case we have

$$C_{S^1,\, d(K)+2k-1}(F_{a,K},\ S^1 \cdot x_1^m) = 0, \qquad \forall k \in \mathbf{Z}, m \in \mathbf{N}. \tag{6.28}$$

By (iv) of Claim 1, we have $i(y_2) \geq -1$ and it is odd. Then we continue our proof in two subcases:

Subcase 1.1. $i(y_2) \geq 1$.

In this case, we have $i(y_2^m) \geq 0$ by (i) of Claim 1. Thus by (5.2) of Proposition 5.2, we have $C_{S^1,\, d(K)-1}(F_{a,K},\ S^1 \cdot x_2^m) = 0$ for all $m \in \mathbf{N}$. Combining it with (6.28), we get

$$m_{-1} = 0. \tag{6.29}$$

Here and below in this Section m_i is the coefficient of t^i of $M(t) = \sum_{i \in \mathbf{Z}} m_i t^i$ in (5.14).

By (6.13), (6.16) and (vii) of Claim 1, we have $i(y_1) = -2$ or $i(y_1) \geq 0$.

If $i(y_1) = -2$, by Proposition 5.2, we have $C_{S^1,\, d(K)-2}(F_{a,K},\ S^1 \cdot x_1) = \mathbf{Q}$. Thus we have

$$m_{-2} \geq 1. \tag{6.30}$$

Since $i(y_2) \geq 1$ and $i(y_1) = -2$, we get $C_{S^1,\, d(K)-q}(F_{a,K},\ S^1 \cdot x_j^m) = 0$ for all $m \in \mathbf{N}$ and $q \geq 3$ with $j = 1, 2$. Thus we obtain

$$m_{-q} = 0, \qquad \forall q \geq 3. \tag{6.31}$$

Then we have $m_{-1} \geq m_{-2} \geq 1$ by (6.30), (6.31) and (5.15), which contradicts to (6.29).

If $i(y_1) \geq 0$. Noticing that $i(y_2) \geq 1$, from Proposition 6.2 we know that the two closed characteristics are elliptic which contradicts to our assumption too.

Subcase 1.2. $i(y_2) = -1$.

In this case, $\hat{i}(y_2) = 2$ by (i) of Claim 1, and $i(\psi_2) = 1$ by (iv) of Claim 1. Using the Bott-type formulae (Theorem 9.2.1 of [Lon3]) and (iii) of Claim 1, we have

$$i_{-1}(\psi_2^m) = i(\psi_2^{2m}) - i(\psi_2^m), \qquad \forall\, m \in \mathbf{N}. \tag{6.32}$$

Specially we obtain

$$i_{-1}(\psi_2) = i(\psi_2^2) - i(\psi_2) = i(y_2) + 2 - i(\psi_2) = -1 + 2 - 1 = 0.$$

From Definition 3.6, we have $\bar{i}(y_2^m) = i_{-1}(\psi_2^m)$ and then from (6.32) we obtain

$$\bar{i}(y_2) = i_{-1}(\psi_2) = 0. \tag{6.33}$$

By Lemma 5.5, we have

$$\hat{\bar{i}}(y_2) = \frac{\hat{i}(y_2)}{2} = 1. \tag{6.34}$$

$$\hat{\bar{i}}(y_1) = \frac{\hat{i}(y_1)}{2} > 0. \tag{6.35}$$

Then we can apply Theorem 1.1 to get

$$\frac{\hat{\bar{\chi}}(y_1)}{\hat{\bar{i}}(y_1)} + \frac{\hat{\bar{\chi}}(y_2)}{\hat{\bar{i}}(y_2)} = 1. \tag{6.36}$$

By (3.20) and (6.33), we have

$$\hat{\bar{\chi}}(y_2) = (-1)^{\bar{i}(y_2)} = 1. \tag{6.37}$$

It then follows from (6.34)-(6.37) that

$$\hat{\bar{\chi}}(y_1) = 0. \tag{6.38}$$

Because in this case $\bar{\nu}(y_1^m) = 1$ holds for all $m \in 2\mathbf{N} - 1$, thus we can use (3.20) again, and obtain $\hat{\bar{\chi}}(y_1) = (-1)^{\bar{i}(y_1)} \neq 0$, which contradicts to (6.38). This completes the proof of Case 1.

Case 2. $\gamma_1(\tau_1)$ can be connected to $N_1(1,1)\diamond R(\theta)$ within $\Omega^0(\gamma_1(\tau_1))$ with some $\theta \in (0,\pi) \cup (\pi, 2\pi)$ and $\theta/\pi \in \mathbf{Q}$.

In this case, we have always $K(y_1) \geq 3$ by the definition of θ. By Theorems 8.1.4 and 8.1.7 of [Lon3] and Theorem 6.1 we obtain

$$i(y_1, 1) \quad \text{and} \quad i(y_1) \quad \text{are even.} \tag{6.39}$$

By Theorem 1.3 of [Lon2] (i.e., Theorem 8.3.1 of [Lon3]), we have

$$i(y_1, m) = mi(y_1, 1) + 2E(\frac{m\theta}{2\pi}) - 2.$$

By Theorem 6.1, we obtain

$$i(y_1^m) = m(i(y_1) + 2) + 2E(\frac{m\theta}{2\pi}) - 4. \tag{6.40}$$

Then

$$\hat{i}(y_1) = i(y_1) + 2 + \frac{\theta}{\pi}. \tag{6.41}$$

In this case, by (ii) and (v)-(viii) of Claim 1 we obtain

$$\frac{\hat{\chi}(y_1)}{\hat{i}(y_1)} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\hat{i}(y_2)} > \frac{1}{2}. \tag{6.42}$$

On the other hand, by (5.7) we have

$$\hat{\chi}(y_1) \;=\; \frac{K(y_1) - 1 + k_0(y_1^{K(y_1)}) - k_1(y_1^{K(y_1)}) + k_2(y_1^{K(y_1)})}{K(y_1)} \;\leq\; 1. \tag{6.43}$$

Thus we obtain

$$0 < \hat{i}(y_1) < 2. \tag{6.44}$$

Together with (6.39) and (6.41), it yields

$$i(y_1) = -2. \tag{6.45}$$

Then by (6.40) we obtain that

$$i(y_1^m) = 2E(\frac{m\theta}{2\pi}) - 4 \geq -2, \quad \forall\, m \in \mathbf{N}, \tag{6.46}$$

$$\nu(y_1^m) = 1, \quad \text{if } m \neq 0 \mod K(y_1), \tag{6.47}$$

$$\nu(y_1^{K(y_1)}) = 3. \tag{6.48}$$

Specially we obtain $\frac{K(y_1)\theta}{2\pi} \in \mathbf{N}$ and

$$\hat{i}(y_1) = \frac{\theta}{\pi} \geq \frac{2}{K(y_1)}. \tag{6.49}$$

Because $\nu(y_1) = 1$, by Proposition 5.2 we have $C_{S^1,\, d(K)-2}(F_{a,K},\ S^1 \cdot x_1) = \mathbf{Q}$. This proves

$$m_{-2} \geq 1. \tag{6.50}$$

Note that by (i) and (ii) of Claim 1, we have $i(y_2) \geq -1$, and then $i(y_2^m) \geq -1$ for all $m \in \mathbf{N}$. Thus we have

$$C_{S^1,\, d(K)-q}(F_{a,K},\ S^1 \cdot x_j^m) = 0, \qquad \forall\, m \in \mathbf{N},\ q \geq 3,\ j = 1, 2.$$

Thus we have

$$m_{-q} = 0, \qquad \forall\, q \geq 3. \tag{6.51}$$

By (5.15), we get

$$m_{-1} \geq 1. \tag{6.52}$$

In order to make (6.52) hold, there are two possibilities. The first is that y_1 contributes a positive integer to m_{-1}, by (6.46) and Proposition 5.2 which needs

$$\begin{cases} i(y_1^m) = -2, \qquad \forall\ 1 \le m \le K(y_1), \\ k_1(y_1^{K(y_1)}) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad k_0(y_1^{K(y_1)}) = k_2(y_1^{K(y_1)}) = 0. \end{cases} \tag{6.53}$$

The second is that y_2 contributes a 1 to m_{-1}, which requires $i(y_2) = -1$ by (iv) of Claim 1.

In the second possibility of $i(y_2) = -1$, by (i) of Claim 1 we have $\hat{i}(y_2) = 2$. Then by (6.42) and (6.43), we obtain $\hat{i}(y_1) = \hat{\chi}(y_1) \le 1$. Because $\theta \ne \pi$, together with (6.41) and (6.45), it implies $\frac{\theta}{\pi} = \hat{i}(y_1) < 1$, which implies $i(y_1^2) = -2$ by (6.46). By (6.47) and Proposition 5.2, we then obtain $C_{S^1,\, d(K)-2}(F_{a,K},\ S^1 \cdot x_1^m) = \mathbf{Q}$ for $m = 1$ and 2, which implies $m_{-2} \ge 2$, and then $m_{-1} \ge 2$ by (5.15) and (6.51). Now by the fact $i(y_2) = -1$ and (vi) of Claim 1, $\{y_1^m\}$ needs to contribute to m_{-1} too, and then we must have $C_{S^1,\, d(K)-1}(F_{a,K},\ S^1 \cdot x_1^m) \ne 0$ for some $m \in \mathbf{N}$. This implies that (6.53) holds always.

Then (6.53) implies $K(y_1)\theta = 2\pi$, and by (6.46) we obtain

$$\hat{i}(y_1) = \frac{\theta}{\pi} = \frac{2}{K(y_1)}. \tag{6.54}$$

Therefore by (6.47), (6.53), (vi) of Claim 1, Proposition 5.2, and (5.15), noticing that y_2^m contribute at most a 1 to m_{-1}, we have

$$k_1(y_1^{K(y_1)}) + 1 \ge m_{-1} \ge m_{-2} = K(y_1) - 1.$$

Therefore by (6.43) we obtain

$$\hat{\chi}(y_1) \le \frac{1}{K(y_1)}.$$

Together with (6.49) we then obtain

$$\frac{\hat{\chi}(y_1)}{\hat{i}(y_1)} \le \frac{1}{2},$$

which contradicts to (6.42).

Case 3. *$\gamma_1(\tau_1)$ can be connected to $N_1(1,1)\diamond N_1(1,b)$ within $\Omega^0(\gamma_1(\tau_1))$ with $b = 0$ or 1.*

In this case, $i(y_1, 1)$ and then $i(y_1)$ is even by Theorem 8.1.4 of [Lon3] and Theorem 6.1. By Theorem 8.3.1 of [Lon3], we obtain $i(y_1, m) = m(i(y_1, 1) + 2) - 2$ for all $m \in \mathbf{N}$. Thus by Theorem 6.1 we have

$$i(y^m) = m(i(y_1) + 4) - 4, \qquad \forall\ m \in \mathbf{N}.$$

And then $\hat{i}(y_1) = i(y_1) + 4$. Because $\hat{i}(y_1) > 0$ by (vii) of Claim 1, we obtain $i(y_1) \geq -2$. By Proposition 5.4, we have $K(y_1) = 1$. From (5.7) and Remark 5.6, we then obtain

$$\frac{\hat{\chi}(y_1)}{\hat{i}(y_1)} = \frac{k_0(y_1) - k_1(y_1) + k_2(y_1)}{i(y_1) + 4} \leq \frac{1}{2},$$

which contradicts to (viii) of Claim 1.

Case 4. *$\gamma_1(\tau_1)$ can be connected to $N_1(1,1)\diamond N_1(1,-1)$ within $\Omega^0(\gamma_1(\tau_1))$.*

In this case, $i(y_1, 1)$ and then $i(y_1)$ is odd by Theorem 8.1.4 of [Lon3] and Theorem 6.1. By Theorem 8.3.1 of [Lon3], we have $i(y, m) = m(i(y, 1) + 1) - 1$ for all $m \in \mathbf{N}$. Thus by Theorem 6.1, we obtain

$$i(y_1^m) = m(i(y_1) + 3) - 3, \qquad \forall\, m \in \mathbf{N}.$$

And then $\hat{i}(y_1) = i(y_1) + 3$. Because $\hat{i}(y_1) > 0$ by (vii) of Claim 1, we obtain

$$i(y_1) \geq -1.$$

By Proposition 5.4, we have $K(y_1) = 1$. Because $\nu(y_1) = 2$ and Remark 5.6, we have $k_1(y_1) = 1$ or 0. Therefore we get

$$\frac{\hat{\chi}(y_1)}{\hat{i}(y_1)} = -\frac{k_0(y_1) - k_1(y_1)}{i(y_1) + 3} \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

It contradicts to (viii) of Claim 1.

The proof of Theorem 1.4 is complete. ∎

Acknowledgment. The authors sincerely thank the referee for his valuable comments and suggestions on this paper.

References

[BaL1] V. Bangert and Y. Long, The existence of two closed geodesics on every Finsler 2-sphere, *Math. Ann.* 346 (2010), 335-366.

[BLMR] H. Berestycki, J. M. Lasry, G. Mancini and B. Ruf, Existence of multiple periodic orbits on starshaped Hamiltonian systems, *Comm. Pure. Appl. Math.* 38 (1985), 253-289.

[CGH1] D. Cristofaro-Gardiner and M. Hutchings, From one Reeb orbit to two. arXiv:1202.4839v2, (2012). *J. Diff. Geom.* to appear.

[DDE1] G. Dell'Antoio, B. D'Onofrio, and I. Ekeland, Les systèmes hamiltoniens convexes et pairs ne sont pas ergodiques en général, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I* 315 (1992), 1413-1415.

[Eke1] I. Ekeland, An index theory for periodic solutions of convex Hamiltonian systems. *Proc. Symp. in Pure Math.* 45 (1986), 395-423.

[Eke2] I. Ekeland, Convexity Methods in Hamiltonian Mechanics. Springer-Verlag. Berlin. 1990.

[EkH1] I. Ekeland and H. Hofer, Convex Hamiltonian energy surfaces and their closed trajectories, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 113 (1987), 419-467.

[EkL1] I. Ekeland and L. Lassoued, Multiplicité des trajectoires fermées d'un systéme hamiltonien sur une hypersurface d'energie convexe. *Ann. IHP. Anal. non Linéaire.* 4 (1987), 1-29.

[GiG1] V.L. Ginzburg, Y. Goren, Iterated index and the mean Euler characteristic. *Journal of Topology and Analysis.* 7 (2015), 453-481.

[GHHM] V.L. Ginzburg, D. Hein, U.L. Hryniewicz, and L. Macarini, Closed Reeb orbits on the sphere and symplectically degenerate maxima. *Acta Math Vietnam.* 38 (2013), 55-78.

[Gir1] M. Girardi, Multiple orbits for Hamiltonian systems on starshaped ernergy surfaces with symmetry, *Ann. IHP. Analyse non linéaire.* 1 (1984), 285-294.

[GrM1] D. Gromoll and W. Meyer, On differentiable functions with isolated critical points, *Topology.* 8 (1969), 361-369.

[HWZ1] H. Hofer, K. Wysocki, and E. Zehnder, The dynamics on three-dimensional strictly convex energy surfaces. *Ann. of Math.* 148 (1998), 197-289.

[HuL1] X. Hu and Y. Long, Closed characteristics on non-degenerate star-shaped hypersurfaces in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$, *Sci. China Ser. A* 45 (2002), 1038-1052.

[LLo1] H. Liu and Y. Long, Resonance identity for symmetric closed characteristics on symmetric convex Hamiltonian energy hypersurfaces and its applications. *J. Diff. Equa.* 255 (2013), 2952-2980.

[LLo2] H. Liu and Y. Long, The existence of two closed characteristics on every compact star-shaped hypersurface in $\mathbf{R}^4$. *Acta Math. Sinica* (2014), DOI: 10.1007/s10114-014-4108-1.

[LLW1] H. Liu, Y. Long and W. Wang, Resonance identities for closed characteristics on compact star-shaped hypersurfaces in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$. *J. Funct. Anal.* 166 (2014), 5598-5638.

[LLWZ] H. Liu, Y. Long, W. Wang and P. Zhang, Symmetric closed characteristics on symmetric compact convex hypersurfaces in $\mathbf{R}^8$. *Commun. Math. Stat.* 2 (2014), 393-411.

[LLZ1] C. Liu, Y. Long and C. Zhu, Multiplicity of closed characteristics on symmetric convex hypersurfaces in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$. *Math. Ann.* 323 (2002), 201-215.

[Lon1] Y. Long, Hyperbolic closed characteristics on compact convex smooth hypersurfaces in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$. *J. Diff. Equa.* 150 (1998), 227-249.

[Lon2] Y. Long, Precise iteration formulae of the Maslov-type index theory and ellipticity of closed characteristics. *Advances in Math.* 154 (2000), 76-131.

[Lon3] Y. Long, Index Theory for Symplectic Paths with Applications. Progress in Math. 207, Birkhäuser. Basel. 2002.

[LoZ1] Y. Long and C. Zhu, Closed characteristics on compact convex hypersurfaces in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$. *Ann. of Math.* 155 (2002), 317-368.

[Rab1] P. Rabinowitz, Periodic solutions of Hamiltonian systems, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 31 (1978), 157-184.

[Rad1] H.-B. Rademacher, Morse Theorie und geschlossene Geodatische, *Bonner Math. Schriften Nr.* 229 (1992).

[Szu1] A. Szulkin, Morse theory and existence of periodic solutions of convex Hamiltonian systems, *Bull. Soc. Math. France.* 116 (1988), 171-197.

[Vit1] C. Viterbo, Une théorie de Morse pour les systèmes hamiltoniens étoilés, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Ser. I Math.* 301 (1985), 487-489.

[Vit2] C. Viterbo, Equivariant Morse theory for starshaped Hamiltonian systems. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 311 (1989), 621-655.

[Wan1] W. Wang, Stability of closed characteristics on compact convex hypersurfaces in $\mathbf{R}^6$. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* 11 (2009), 575-596.

[Wan2] W. Wang, Existence of closed characteristics on compact convex hypersurfaces in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$. arXiv:1112.5501v3, (2011).

[Wan3] W. Wang, Closed trajectories on symmetric convex Hamiltonian energy surfaces, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* 32 (2012), no. 2, 679-701.

[WHL1] W. Wang, X. Hu and Y. Long, Resonance identity, stability and multiplicity of closed characteristics on compact convex hypersurfaces. *Duke Math. J.* 139 (2007), 411-462.

[Wei1] A. Weinstein, Periodic orbits for convex Hamiltonian systems, *Ann. of Math.* 108 (1978), 507-518.